

SENATE—Wednesday, April 24, 1968

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, who committest to us the swift and solemn trust of life, since we know not what a day may bring forth, but only that the hour for serving Thee is always present, may we wake to the instant claims of Thy holy will; not waiting for tomorrow, but yielding today.

Consecrate with Thy presence the way our feet may go; and the humblest work will shine, and the roughest places be made plain. Lift us above unrighteous anger and mistrust to faith, and hope, and charity.

Hasten, we beseech Thee, through us, the day of an ampler life for all, when every man shall dwell in safety among his neighbors, free from gnawing want, free from torturing fears.

"We pledge our hopes, our faith, our lives,
That freedom shall not die:
We pray Thy guidance, strength, and grace:
Almighty God on high."

For Thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, April 23, 1968, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in relation to the transaction of routine morning business be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization of the Committee on Government Operations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Government Research of the Committee on Government Operations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I understand that objection will be made to the next request, but in view of the fact that the request was made, I am going to ask it, anyway.

I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, by request, I shall have to object to the request of the acting majority leader.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of three unobjected to bills which have been on the Calendar since April 10, 1968. They are Calendar Nos. 1073, 1074, and 1075.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TALMADGE in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

PURCHASE OF U.S. OBLIGATIONS

The bill (H.R. 15344) to amend section 14(b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, to extend for 2 years the authority of Federal Reserve banks to purchase U.S. obligations directly from the Treasury was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1091), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

H.R. 15344 would extend for 2 additional years the authority of the Federal Reserve Board to purchase public debt obligations directly from the Treasury up to a limit of \$5 billion outstanding at any one time. This authority, which would otherwise expire on June 30, 1968, was first granted in its present form in 1942 for a temporary period. It has been renewed by the Congress on 13 separate occasions since that time. While the direct purchase authority has been used sparingly over the years, it has proven to be essential to efficient financial management.

Continuation of the direct purchase authority is necessary for three reasons:

One, the direct purchase authority permits the Treasury to maintain lower cash balances since any temporary or seasonal shortage could be accommodated through direct borrowing from the Federal Reserve System. By maintaining a lower level of cash balances, the interest expenses on the national debt are correspondingly reduced;

Two, the direct purchase authority permits the Treasury an alternative source of borrowing when conditions in the money markets are temporarily unfavorable. The Treasury is able to postpone for a short time market borrowing when such borrowing could be extremely disruptive;

Third, the direct purchase authority is a big element in our financial planning for a national defense emergency. In these circumstances, the Government could need an immediate and ready source of cash at a time when our financial markets were seriously disrupted. It is for this reason that an authority as large as \$5 billion is required although such a large amount has never been used.

THE PRACTICE OF PSYCHOLOGY IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1864) to define and regulate the practice of psychology in the District of Columbia which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That this Act may be cited as the "Practice of Psychology Act".

SEC. 2. The practice of psychology in the District of Columbia is hereby declared to affect the public health, safety, and welfare, and to be subject to regulation and control in the public interest to protect the public from the unauthorized and unqualified practice of psychology, and from unprofessional conduct by persons licensed to practice psychology.

SEC. 3. As used in this Act:

(A) "Commissioner" means the Commissioner of the District of Columbia or his authorized agent or agents.

(B) "Person" includes an association, partnership, or corporation, as well as natural persons.

(C) "Accredited college or university" means any college or university which, in the Commissioner's determination, offers either an acceptable full-time resident graduate program of study in psychology leading to the doctoral degree, or a comparable program. In making his determination concerning domestic educational institutions, the Commissioner shall accredit those institutions included in the listings of approved

academic institutions public by the United States Office of Education; in determining what foreign educational institutions shall be accredited the Commissioner may take into account the published lists of accrediting agencies and of professional associations.

(D) "The practice of psychology" is the rendering of or offering to render to the public for a fee, monetary or otherwise, any service involving the application of established methods and principles of the science and profession of psychology, except as provided in sections 5 and 20 of this Act. These principles and methods are concerned with understanding, predicting, and changing behavior, and they include, but are not restricted to, the use of counseling and psychotherapy with groups or individuals having adjustment problems in the areas of work, family, school, and personal relationships; measuring, testing, and assessing aptitudes, skills, public opinion, attitudes, emotions, personality, and intelligence; teaching or lecturing in psychology and doing research on problems relating to human behavior.

(E) Nothing in subsection (D) shall be construed as permitting either the administration or prescription of drugs or any infringement upon the practice of medicine as defined by the Healing Arts Practice Act of the District of Columbia, approved February 27, 1929 (45 Stat. 1326), as amended.

Sec. 4. The psychologist who engages in practice is expected to assist his client in obtaining professional help for all relevant aspects of the client's problem that fall outside of the boundaries of the psychologist's own competence; for example, provision should be made for the diagnosis and treatment of relevant medical problems by an appropriate, qualified medical practitioner.

Sec. 5. It shall be unlawful for any person to practice or to offer to practice psychology, or to represent himself to be a psychologist, unless he shall first obtain a license or certificate pursuant to this Act, except as hereinafter provided.

(A) Nothing in this Act shall be construed to limit the activities of and use of the title "psychologist" by a person in the employ of any governmental agency, academic institution, charitable agency, research laboratory, or business corporation: *Provided*, That the services performed by such an employee are a part of his office or position and are provided only within the confines of the organization or are offered to like organizations. Persons providing services to the public through governmental organizations, such as clinics, who are compensated by their employer rather than their clients are also exempted under the Act. Persons coming under the exemptions established by this subsection may offer lecture services to the public for a fee but may not offer other psychological services to the public for a fee without having obtained a license.

(B) Nothing in this Act shall be construed to limit the activities of a student intern, or resident in psychology, pursuing a course of study or research with an accredited college, university, or training center: *Provided*, That such activities are supervised as part of his course of study, and he is designated by such title as "psychology intern," "psychology trainee," or other title clearly indicating trainee status.

(C) Nothing in this Act shall prevent the employment by a person furnishing psychological services for remuneration, of an individual not licensed as a psychologist under the provisions of this Act to assist in the performance of psychological and other services, if such individual works under the supervision of a licensed psychologist who assumes full responsibility for his acts, and if such individual is not in any manner held out to the public as a psychologist.

Sec. 6. (A) The Commissioner shall be responsible for reviewing the applications of persons seeking licensure or certification for

the practice of psychology in the District of Columbia, for the granting and renewal of such licenses and certificates, for the preparation and administration of oral and written examinations, and for other matters related to the purposes of this Act.

(B) The Commissioner may appoint a Board of Psychologist Examiners. Each member shall be a citizen of the United States, licensed under the provisions of this Act, who shall either be a resident of the District of Columbia or have worked in the District of Columbia for at least two years preceding appointment to the Board. The initial appointees shall be psychologists eligible for licensure under provisions of this Act.

(C) The Commissioner shall maintain: (1) a record of licenses and certificates granted and refused and of licenses and certificates revoked or suspended which record shall be available to the public; and (2) a complete record of all hearings conducted pursuant to section 15(B) in connection with the denial, suspension, or revocation of a license. A transcript of an entry in a record of hearing, properly certified, shall be prima facie evidence of the facts therein stated.

Sec. 7. The Commissioner shall grant a license to practice psychology to each applicant who submits satisfactory proof that—

(A) he is of good moral character;

(B) he holds either (1) a doctoral degree in psychology from an accredited college or university and has completed two years of postgraduate experience acceptable to the Commissioner, such two years not to include terms of internship, or (2) a doctoral degree in a field related to psychology from an accredited college or university, plus two years of postgraduate experience: *Provided*, That his experience and training are considered by the Commissioner to be comparable to the requirements set forth in (B)(1) of this subsection;

(C) he has passed an examination, written or oral or both, the scope and form of which shall be determined by the Commissioner: *Provided*, That at any given examination session all examinations shall be uniform; and

(D) his application has been accompanied by the necessary fees.

Sec. 8. Within one year from and after the effective date of this Act, a license shall be issued without examination to any applicant who is of good moral character, who either maintains a residence or office, or participates in psychological activities, as determined by the Commissioner, within the District of Columbia, who has submitted an application for license accompanied by the required fee, and who holds—

(A) a doctoral degree in psychology from an accredited college or university or other doctoral degree acceptable to the Commissioner, and has completed at least one year of postgraduate experience not including terms of internship; or

(B) a master's degree in psychology from an accredited college or university, and has engaged in psychological practice acceptable to the Commissioner for five years after the attainment of his highest degree.

Sec. 9. The Commissioner may, in his discretion, grant a license without examination, on payment of the required fee, to any person who at the time of application is licensed or certified under the laws of a State or territory of the United States, or of a foreign country or province whose standards, in the opinion of the Commissioner, were substantially equivalent at the date of such certification or licensure, to the requirements of this Act.

Sec. 10. A psychologist who is not licensed under the provisions of this Act, but (1) who is licensed or certified under the laws of a State or territory of the United States or of a foreign country or province whose standards in the opinion of the Commissioner were substantially equivalent, at the

date of his certification or licensure, to the requirements of this Act, or (2) who meets the requirements of subsections (A) and (B) of section 7 and resides in a State or territory of the United States, or in a foreign country or province which does not grant licenses or certificates to psychologists, may be employed or invited by a person who is a resident of or maintains a place of work in the District of Columbia to offer professional services in said District for a total of not more than sixty days in any calendar year without holding a license issued under this Act. Upon arrival in the District of Columbia, such a psychologist shall report to the Commissioner with respect to the nature and duration of his professional activities in the District as well as the name of the person who has requested him to render services.

A psychologist claiming exemption under the provisions of this section who offers professional services in the District of Columbia for more than twenty days in any calendar year shall file with the Commissioner evidence of his right to such exemption. Upon proof of that right, to the satisfaction of the Commissioner, the Commissioner shall enter the name of the applicant in a register kept for that purpose and shall issue to the applicant a certificate in evidence of such registration.

Sec. 11. The Commissioner may, in his discretion, waive all or part of the examination required under section 7(C) of this Act when the applicant has (1) achieved a position of eminence in the practice of psychology and has demonstrated, over a number of years, competence in areas covered by the examination, or (2) has been certified by a national examining board: *Provided*, That the examination given by the national examining board was as effective for the testing of professional competence as that required in the District of Columbia.

Sec. 12. The District of Columbia Council is authorized to make regulations to carry out the purposes of this Act, and, after public hearings, to fix, increase, or decrease fees to be charged for services performed by the District government pursuant to the provisions of this Act, in such amounts as may, in the judgment of the Council, be reasonably necessary to defray the approximate cost of administering this Act.

Sec. 13. Every person licensed or certified to practice psychology who desires to continue the practice of psychology shall annually pay the required fee for which there will be issued a renewal of licensure or certificate. The Commissioner shall provide a written reminder of the renewal date to every person licensed or registered under this Act, which reminder shall be mailed at least one month in advance. A license or certificate not properly renewed as herein provided shall lapse. The Commissioner shall have the right to reinstate a lapsed license or certificate upon payment of the renewal fee plus a penalty fee. A psychologist who wishes to place his license upon an inactive status may do so by submitting notice thereof to the Commissioner. Such a psychologist may reactivate his license by payment of the renewal fee herein required unless his license has been inactive for a period exceeding five years, in which case he will be required to furnish the Commissioner evidence of his competence to continue or resume the practice of psychology.

Sec. 14. The Commissioner may refuse, revoke, or suspend licensure or certification if the person applying or the person licensed or certified be:

(A) convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude;

(B) found to be using any drug or any alcoholic beverage to an extent or in a manner dangerous to himself, any other person, or the public, or to an extent that such use impairs his ability to perform the work of a psychologist with safety to the public;

(C) convicted of a violation of any pro-

vision of this Act or of the regulations or rules promulgated pursuant thereto;

(D) determined to be a mental incompetent by a court with proper jurisdiction; or

(E) found guilty of the unethical practice of psychology in violation of standards to be established by the Commissioner.

SEC. 15. (A) Proceedings leading toward the suspension or revocation of a license or certificate shall be begun by petition, setting forth good cause therefor, filed with the Commissioner and served on the respondent.

The Commissioner may determine whether a license or certificate shall be suspended or revoked, and if it is to be suspended the duration of such suspension and the conditions under which such suspension shall terminate. Revocation of a license shall not preclude the issuance after the passage of at least five years of a new license or registration to the offender, provided such person can show that he has complied with the provisions of this Act.

(B) Before the revoking, suspending, or refusing to issue a license or certificate for any cause under the provisions of this Act, the Commissioner shall give the person whose right to practice psychology is challenged an opportunity to be heard in person or by attorney, and to produce witnesses on his behalf. After such hearing, should the Commissioner decide to refuse, revoke, or suspend licensure or certification, he shall set forth in writing his reasons for so doing, and shall include detailed findings of fact.

(C) Any person who feels aggrieved by a decision of the Commissioner under subsection (B) of this section may, within thirty days after receiving notice thereof, seek review of said decision in the District of Columbia Court of Appeals. Such review shall be subject to appeal to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit.

(D) In hearings conducted pursuant to subsection (B) of this section, the attendance and testimony of witnesses may be compelled by subpoena. Any person refusing to respond to such a subpoena shall be guilty of contempt of court and may be punished as other persons guilty of contempt of court are punished.

SEC. 16. Any person who shall practice psychology, as defined in this Act, without having a valid, unexpired, unrevoked, and unsuspended license or certificate of registration issued under this Act, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than \$500 or confined in jail for not more than six months, or both.

SEC. 17. The unlawful practice of psychology as defined in this Act may be enjoined by the United States District Court for the District of Columbia on petition by the Commissioner, upon a finding that the person sought to be enjoined is guilty of a violation of the provisions of this Act. In any such proceeding it shall not be necessary to show that any person is individually injured by the actions complained of. If the respondent is found guilty of the unlawful practice of psychology, the court shall enjoin him from so practicing unless and until he has been duly licensed. The remedy by injunction hereby given is in addition to criminal prosecution and punishment based thereon, and not in lieu thereof.

SEC. 18. It shall be the duty of the Commissioner of the District of Columbia to enforce the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 19. In legal proceedings, no psychologist shall disclose any information he has acquired from a person consulting him in his professional capacity without the consent of such person, except only (1) in actions, civil or criminal in which a psychologist is suing or being sued by a former client or his legal representative, such as an action against a psychologist for malpractice, (2) upon an issue as to the validity of a document, such

as a will of a client, (3) in cases where the defendant to a criminal action has raised the defense of mental incapacity.

SEC. 20. (A) Nothing in this Act shall be construed as restricting the use of tools, tests, instruments, or techniques usually denominated "psychological," provided that the user does not represent himself or itself in a manner prohibited by this Act.

(B) Nothing in this Act shall be construed to prevent qualified members of other professions from doing work of a psychological nature consistent with their training and with the code of ethics of their respective professions: *Provided*, That they do not hold themselves out to the public by any title or description incorporating the words "psychological," "psychologist," or "psychology," unless licensed under this Act, and except as provided in section 5(D) of this Act.

SEC. 21. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated out of the revenues of the District of Columbia such sums as may be necessary to pay the expenses of administering and carrying out the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 22. If any section of this Act, or any part thereof, shall be adjudged by any court of competent jurisdiction to be invalid, such judgment shall not affect, impair, or invalidate the remainder of any section or part thereof.

SEC. 23. This Act shall become effective ninety days after the date of its enactment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

MR. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1092), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to provide for the protection of the public from the unqualified practice of psychology and from unprofessional conduct of persons practicing psychology in the District of Columbia by requiring all persons who offer psychological services to the public for a fee to obtain a license from the District of Columbia government.

NEED FOR THE LEGISLATION

At the present time, psychologists may practice psychology in the District of Columbia without license or regulation. Your committee has been advised that there have been incidents in which the lives and well-being of residents in the Nation's Capital have been adversely affected by fraudulent persons representing themselves as psychologists. This is happening at a time when the profession of psychology is clearly expanding and is more and more in demand by citizens of this city and elsewhere in the country. Therefore, your committee believes that the bill incorporates the appropriate and necessary steps which must be taken promptly to regulate the quality of psychological services by regulating the practice of psychology as existing law already requires the regulation of other professions within the city.

HEARING

The Subcommittee on Public Health, Education, Welfare, and Safety held a hearing on S. 1864 on August 28, 1967. The bill received the support of the District of Columbia government, the District of Columbia Psychological Association, and the American Psychological Association.

PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

The first section of the bill cites the act as the "Practice of Psychology Act."

Section 2 declares the practice of psychology to affect the public health, safety,

and welfare, and to be subject to regulation and control in the public interest.

Section 3 defines terms used in the bill and provides that "the practice of psychology," as defined in the bill, shall not be construed as permitting the administration or prescription of drugs or any infringement upon the practice of medicine as defined by the Healing Arts Practice Act of the District of Columbia, as amended.

Section 4 states that psychologists are expected to assist their clients in obtaining professional help for aspects of the client's problems that fall outside the area of the psychologists' own competence; for example, that provision should be made for the diagnosis and treatment of relevant medical problems by an appropriate, qualified medical practitioner.

Section 5 requires the licensing of persons who practice psychology for a fee; exempting psychologists employed by Government agencies, academic institutions, charitable agencies, research laboratories, and business corporations. Also exempted are psychology interns and residents, and persons employed by licensed psychologists as defined in the bill.

Section 6 provides that the Commissioner shall be responsible for the issuance and renewal of licenses, authorizes him to provide for the preparation and administration of oral and written examinations, to appoint a Board of Psychologist Examiners to examine applicants for licenses, and requires the maintenance of public records respecting the granting, refusal, suspension, and revocation of licenses.

Section 7 sets forth the requirements for obtaining a license: Good moral character; doctoral degree in psychology or a related field; plus 2 years of postgraduate experience other than internship; and satisfactory performance in an examination.

Section 8 provides for licensing within 1 year without examination of psychologists who either maintain a residence or office, or participate in psychological activities in the District and who have a doctoral degree and 1 year of postgraduate experience or a master's degree in psychology and five years of practice acceptable to the Commissioner.

Section 9 authorizes the Commissioner to grant a license without examination to any person who has received a license from a State or foreign country whose standards are substantially equivalent to those of the District of Columbia.

Section 10 provides that qualified psychologists from outside the District of Columbia may offer professional services in the District for not more than 60 days a year without obtaining a license on request of a person who resides or works in the District. A psychologist claiming this exemption and who offers his professional service within the District for more than 20 days in any calendar year must file with the Commissioner evidence of his right thereto, have his name entered in a register kept by the Commissioner for that purpose, and be issued a certificate evidencing such registration.

Section 11 empowers the Commissioner to waive the licensure examination when the applicant has achieved a position of eminence as a practicing psychologist or has been certified by a national examining board, whose examination was as effective for testing professional competence as that required in the District of Columbia.

Section 12 authorizes the District of Columbia Council to make regulations to carry out the purposes of the act and to fix fees at levels to defray the expense of administering the act.

Section 13 provides for the annual payment of the required fee for renewal of licenses or certificates issued under the act

and contains provisions respecting the reinstatement of lapsed licenses.

Section 14 authorizes the Commissioner to refuse, revoke, or suspend licensure or certification if the applicant, licensee, or certificate holder be (a) convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude, (b) found to use drugs or alcoholic beverages so as to endanger himself or others or so as to impair his ability to safely perform psychological services, (c) convicted of violating the act or any regulation thereunder, (d) adjudicated mentally incompetent, and (e) found guilty of unethical practice of psychology in violation of standards set by the Commissioner.

Section 15 sets forth the procedures to be followed by the Commissioner in suspending or revoking a license or certificate. Before a license is revoked, suspended, or refused to be issued by the Commissioner for any cause, the person whose right to practice psychology is challenged shall be entitled to a hearing and to produce witnesses on his behalf. Decisions of the Commissioner refusing, revoking, or suspending licensure or certification must be in writing and must include detailed finding of fact. Any person feeling aggrieved by a decision of the Commissioner may seek a review of the Commissioner's decision in the District of Columbia Court of Appeals, which court's decision shall be subject to appeal to the U.S. Court of Appeals District of Columbia.

Section 16 provides that any persons practicing psychology without a license or registration certificate shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction be fined not more than \$500 or confined in jail for not more than 6 months, or both.

Section 17 permits injunction actions in the U.S. district court to prevent persons found guilty of violating the act from continuing to practice psychology.

Section 18 directs the Commissioner to enforce the provisions of the act.

Section 19 provides that in legal proceedings, no psychologist shall disclose any information he has acquired from a person consulting him in his professional capacity without the consent of such person, except (1) in actions, civil or criminal, in which a psychologist is suing or being sued by a former client or his legal representative, such as an action against a psychologist for malpractice, (2) upon an issue as to the validity of a document, such as a will of a client, and (3) in cases where the defendant in a criminal action has raised the defense of mental incapacity.

Section 20 provides that so long as a user does not represent himself or itself in a manner prohibited by the act, nothing in the act shall be construed as restricting the use of tools, tests, instruments, or techniques usually denominated "psychological," and that the act shall not be construed to prevent qualified members of other professions from doing work of a psychological nature consistent with their training and the codes of ethics of their professions, so long as they do not hold themselves out to the public as psychologists unless licensed or certified in accordance with the act.

Section 21 authorizes appropriations necessary to pay the expenses of administering and carrying out the purposes of the act.

Section 22 provides a standard severability clause.

Section 23 provides that the act shall be effective 90 days following its enactment.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

Your committee struck out the term "physical" on page 3, line 18, and inserted in lieu thereof "medical." The purpose of the amendment is to emphasize the nonmedical character of the psychology profession and make clear the committee's intent that a person with organic disease complications to behavioral problems should be referred by the psychologist to a medical doctor. The

amendment was requested by the District of Columbia government.

Your committee deleted section 5, subsection (D), establishing different licensing requirements for social psychologists than for other psychologists. This action was taken because the committee sees no justification for treating social psychologists differently from other psychologists in the matter of licensing.

Your committee deleted the language in section 6(B) requiring the Commissioner to name members of the Board of Psychology Examiners from a list submitted by the District of Columbia Psychology Association. The committee believes that the Commissioner should be permitted to name any qualified psychologist to the Board and not be restricted to any list of names submitted by the above-mentioned professional association.

Your committee deleted the language in section 12 permitting the Commissioner to give a certificate of registration to an association, partnership, or corporation. The committee sees no justification for permitting the group practice of psychology when only one member of the group has a license issued in his individual name since the practice of psychology should, as with other disciplines, be licensed on a personal basis. There is ample provision elsewhere in the bill permitting a psychologist to have a trainee or other unlicensed person assist him providing the psychologist is entirely responsible for the actions of such a person working under the licensed psychologist.

In lieu of the language which has been deleted from section 12, the committee amendment authorizes the District of Columbia Council to make regulations to carry out the purposes of the act, and, after public hearings, fix fees to be charged for services performed by the District government pursuant to the provisions of the act.

Section 21 has been deleted by the committee, as no longer applicable in view of Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1967.

REPAIR OF FIXED EQUIPMENT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2017) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to enter into contracts for the inspection, maintenance, and repair of fixed equipment in District-owned buildings for periods not to exceed 3 years which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with an amendment, on page 1, line 3, after the word "the" strike out "Commissioners of the District of Columbia are" and insert "Commissioner of the District of Columbia is"; so as to make the bill read:

S. 2017

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Commissioner of the District of Columbia is authorized to enter into contracts for periods not exceeding three years for the inspection, maintenance, and repair of fixed equipment in buildings owned by the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1093), explaining the purpose of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of S. 2017, which is requested by the District of Columbia government, is to authorize the District to enter into contracts with private concerns for the inspection, maintenance, and repair of fixed equipment in District-owned buildings for periods up to 3 years. Under existing authority, these contracts must be executed annually. S. 2017 is substantially similar to Public Law 89-276, approved October 20, 1965, conferring authority on the Administrator of General Services to enter into 3-year contracts for the maintenance of fixed equipment in federally owned buildings.

NEED FOR THE LEGISLATION

Under existing law, the District must execute annually contracts for fixed-equipment systems such as heating, refrigeration, ventilating, air conditioning, electrical, vertical transportation, plumbing, fire protection, watchman, fuel, and pneumatic tube systems. The District government has found it more economical and efficient to provide for servicing of this type of equipment under contracts with private firms specializing in such services rather than training skilled technicians and purchasing and storing innumerable spare parts and supplies.

The present 1-year contract limitation precludes the District from obtaining maximum potential benefits and savings. Some contractors engaged on a 1-year basis have not fully carried out their obligation for equipment maintenance and repair. As a result, latent deficiencies have appeared, after a new contractor has been on the job, making it difficult, if not impossible, to prove responsibility for the deficiencies. Consequently, the District government has had to bear the cost of remedying such deficiencies.

A contractor with a 1-year maintenance contract is not encouraged to do more than will keep the equipment operating for that year, since he does not know whether he will be successful in subsequent bidding. Contractors who have had a 1-year contract sometimes refrain from bidding on such work for a subsequent year because they know, from knowledge gained under a prior contract, that abnormal maintenance will probably be required during the ensuing year. Further, a contractor probably would be less likely to neglect needed maintenance during the early years of a long-term contract, since deficiencies could more easily be traced to him and the more extensive maintenance of subsequent years would be his responsibility. Savings through reduction in preparation of plans and specifications and costly advertising would be realized with multiyear contracts.

Contractors would also benefit from multi-year contracts, since they would be able to make larger volume purchases of supplies, spare parts, and equipment. Personnel of the contractor would become better acquainted with the characteristics of the particular equipment being serviced, and the detailed nature of the conditions and circumstances under which the equipment must be operated. This would result in reduced management problems and expense and provide better service to the using agency. A 3-year contract would encourage better planning by the contractor so that current maintenance would be accomplished with the prospect of less effort and expense being required in subsequent years.

HEARING

S. 2017 was the subject of a public hearing by the Subcommittee on the Judiciary on March 8, 1968. Representatives of the District government testified in favor of this legislation. No opposition was expressed to the enactment of the bill.

CONCLUSION

Your committee is of the opinion that longer contracts should result in greater

economy, safety, and efficiency in the maintenance and operation of buildings and equipment owned by the District government.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill to authorize the Commissioner of the District of Columbia to enter into contracts for the inspection, maintenance, and repair of fixed equipment in District-owned buildings for periods not to exceed 3 years."

RELATIVE STRENGTH

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, in recent years there has been consistent effort to downgrade the opinion of the military about military matters, and at the same time upgrade the opinion of others about military matters.

This is one of the reasons for the continuing lack of military success in the Vietnam theater. To that we should add the impact this war is having on our economy, and its negative influence on our political relationship with all other countries. But that is another story.

The most dangerous aspect of recent policy, however, would seem to be that, as a result of the decisions made with respect to where our time, effort, and money should be allocated to maintain the Nation's military posture, it is now an open question as to whether the United States today is, or is not, the strongest military nation in the world.

Some of our most knowledgeable civilian experts on military matters believe that as a result of these decisions as to priorities, the Soviet Union is already stronger militarily than the United States.

These beliefs are not pleasant to contemplate, but the American people have as much right to know about that side of the coin of informed opinion as they have to receive the opinion of those who continue to assure them that the war in Vietnam is going well, and that the military and political position of this country in the world is in as favorable shape today as it has been in the past.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WORLDWIDE COMMUNIST SCHISM

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, recently, officials of the Soviet Union charged that Communist Chinese officials detained a Russian tanker carrying supplies to North Vietnam and that Chinese soldiers broke down doors and used force against the captain and crew of the Soviet ship. The captain of the ship accused the Chinese of having arrested him and his second mate and of phys-

cally assaulting and beating 11 members of his crew. The Soviet Government protested strongly against the unlawful detention on March 27 in Port Whampoa of the Soviet tanker *Komsomolets* carrying a cargo to North Vietnam and against the mistreatment of its crew. Soviet officials stated the Chinese actions were "of a premeditated, provocative nature and a rude violation of international law." Chinese authorities in return charged the Russians with behaving "just like United States imperialists" and stated:

This has clearly exposed the criminal aims of the Soviet leader clique in joining the United States to oppose China.

This was the third serious incident this year of official Soviet protests against the detention of Russian ships and mistreatment of Russian sailors in Chinese ports. Also, earlier this year Soviet leaders charged the Chinese with sabotaging discussions between the two nations on improving shipping conditions along rivers forming borders between the two countries. These incidents are further indication of the bitter enmity that now exists between the two great Communist powers, the Soviet Union and China.

A profound schism exists between the Soviet Union and China, and there has been fighting and bloodshed along their common 6,500 mile border. This belligerency has increased in recent months. Soviet troops were recently stationed in Outer Mongolia, as part of a general Soviet military buildup along the disputed Chinese border to provide protection for that supposed Russian ally against supposedly friendly Communist China. As regarding the most recent incident concerning the detention of a Soviet ship, Chinese Communist leaders have continually denounced and accused the Kremlin leadership of "ganging up" with the United States against China and of "collaborating with U.S. imperialism."

In the Soviet Union last October the 50th anniversary of the revolution was celebrated in a magnificent manner in Moscow. Of 14 Communist countries invited to send their leading governmental officials to this celebration, five nations failed, or refused, to send any delegates whatever. Communist China did not even deign to reply to the invitation. Communist Albania rejected it in scornful language. Then, Kremlin leaders were disturbed because both the North Vietnam and North Korean governments sent minor functionaries to represent them instead of top officials in their governments.

While the military and economic power of the Soviet Union is at an all-time high, the influence of Kremlin leaders on Communist governments throughout the world is at an all-time low. They recently called a meeting of world Communist parties in Hungary proposing to eject China from the Communist movement. Five Communist governments—China, Albania, North Vietnam, North Korea, and Cuba—sent no representatives whatever. Yugoslavia was not invited. The Japanese Commu-

nist Party, one of the largest in the free world, refused the invitation.

The Communist world is clearly in a state of disunity. Recently, top ranking members of the Cuban Communist party were arrested and placed on trial for being too pro-Russian. The Communist party in Czechoslovakia is undergoing an internal political convulsion, which has drastically reduced the power of the pro-Russian element in favor of a younger generation of Communists who openly appeal to nationalism and independence from Russia. Czechoslovakia has become a nationalist Communist nation. It is not a Soviet satellite. Rumania is becoming increasingly more independent, and its delegates walked out of the Budapest conclave. Of the Eastern European Communist countries, only East Germany, still occupied by a substantial armed force of Russian soldiers and airmen, remains a Soviet satellite.

The Budapest Communist meeting was a fiasco. It again revealed the bitter dissension and split between the world's two great Communist powers—the Soviet Union and China.

Nevertheless, rightwing extremists in the United States continue to rant of a monolithic worldwide Communist conspiracy. There is no such thing in truth and in fact. Unfortunately, their hysterical ravings reminiscent of the Joe McCarthy witch-hunting era still influence our foreign policy and work to the detriment of the Nation. Members of that rightwing extremist group of self-appointed vigilantes who term themselves anti-Communists, but who are termed "Birch-saps" by intelligent Americans, represent the last remnant of the witch hunters of the Joe McCarthy era. This reminds one of that couplet, "As I was going up the stair I met a man who wasn't there. He wasn't there again today. I wish, I wish he'd go away."

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Business and Commerce of the District of Columbia Committee be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONVENTION ON THE RECOGNITION AND ENFORCEMENT OF ARBITRAL AWARDS—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from Executive E, 90th Congress, second session, the Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Arbitral Awards, transmitted to the Senate today by the President of the United States, and that the convention, together with the President's message, be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed, and that the President's message be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The message from the President is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to accession, I transmit herewith the Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards, adopted at New York on June 10, 1958.

The provisions of the convention are explained in the report of the Secretary of State and in an accompanying memorandum transmitted herewith. The convention will facilitate the recognition and enforcement by foreign courts of arbitral awards granted in the United States as well as similar action by our courts with respect to foreign arbitral awards.

Thirty-three countries are parties to this convention including such nations with which the United States has major trading relations as France, Germany, India, Japan, the Netherlands, and the Philippines. We have been informed that the United Kingdom is taking steps to accede to the convention. Experience under the convention has established that it contributes in many ways to the promotion of international trade and investment. For example, it provides greater flexibility for the arranging of business transactions abroad; it simplifies the enforcement of foreign arbitral awards; it gives more binding effect to awards and standardizes enforcement procedures; and it strengthens the concept of safeguarding private rights in foreign transactions.

Changes in title 9 (arbitration) of the United States Code will be required before the United States becomes a party to the convention. The United States instrument of accession to the convention will be executed only after the necessary legislation is enacted.

There is substantial support for United States accession to this convention among members of the business community concerned with international trade. Both the American Bar Association and the American Arbitration Association support accession. I recommend that the Senate give its advice and consent to accession subject to two declarations for which provision is made in the convention. In the first, the United States would declare that it will apply the convention to the recognition and enforcement of awards made only in the territory of another Contracting State. In the second, the United States would declare that it will apply the convention only to differences arising out of legal relationships, whether contractual or not, which are considered as commercial under the Federal law of the United States.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 24, 1968.

Enclosures:

1. Report of the Secretary of State.
2. Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Arbitral Awards.

PEACE NEGOTIATIONS IN VIETNAM

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I should like to state my views on

the present controversy raging in the press as to a meeting place for peace negotiations in the Vietnam war.

The President of the United States has made statements to the effect that the United States is willing to go anywhere and meet anywhere in order to talk about peace.

There has been some misunderstanding as to the precise meaning of what the President had in mind about that kind of discussion.

The understanding, from his point of view and that of the Nation, as I understand it, is that our representative would be willing to meet anywhere, go to Hanoi, or even go to Ho Chi Minh's bedroom, if need be, to talk about the fact that we should try to get together and arrange a peace conference and resolve the differences between the two countries.

When we undertake to sit down and formally arrive at a peace treaty, however, there are problems which cannot be arrived at in Ho Chi Minh's bedroom, or in Hanoi. For one thing, to meet with a foreign country to make a treaty of peace, we have to meet where our friends and allies who have an interest in the outcome will be permitted to be present, or to be in the vicinity where they can be consulted and advised, and where they can give their views. Circumstances must be such that our friends will understand us and we will understand them; that they will understand they will not be abandoned, that their interests will most certainly be considered, that whatever agreement is arrived at will be one into which they will feel they have been adequately consulted; we have not and we will not undertake to trespass upon or sacrifice any of the rights of friendly or allied nations without those nations knowing exactly what the terms of an agreement are likely to be. In honor we could not.

There are some countries around the world where some of our friends are not permitted to be present. That is particularly true of some of the Communist countries behind the Iron Curtain. It would create problems with us in meeting some of those countries to have formal negotiation of a peace treaty in countries where we are not confident of adequate police protection being afforded our negotiators. We would need to be in the position of being fairly sure that our negotiators and our friends who are in the vicinity to confer with us would not be subject to having their conference rooms bugged, or their telephones tapped, that we could communicate with one another, and that they could also communicate with their home governments, in order for a proper conference to be held.

Thus, my understanding is that both the suggestions from Hanoi and from the President have made reference to the fact that we want to meet at any suitable or reasonable meeting place. There are a number of places which have been considered which would not be appropriate for a peace conference, for a number of reasons, where everything would be under the control of the adversary, or else our friends or our adversary would object because places might be in areas

that would be friendly or sympathetic to the views of the United States or the allies of the United States.

There have been suggestions as to a number of different places and areas. I have no doubt that if there is any desire or willingness to negotiate, the two sides will find neutral ground acceptable to both.

This Nation has made some suggestions. The powers in North Vietnam have also made some. We have said to them, "If you do not find this place adequate, what we suggest is that you suggest a place you think would be agreeable or more desirable in which to hold a conference."

If the powers in Hanoi are interested in peace, I have no doubt in my mind that this can be resolved, if they will make a few suggestions as to meeting places where they would either be neutral or where our side of the conference table would be under the control of people friendly to this Government and the other side of the conference table would be under the control of people friendly to that government.

Mr. President, I recall a precedent that might serve some useful purpose.

Once, when the Committees on Appropriations of both House and Senate could not agree on a major appropriation bill, they could not agree on where they were going to meet. The position was that one time the House conferees would come over to the Senate and the next time the Senate conferees would go over to the House. The House Members decided that that was no longer satisfactory and insisted that we should always confer on the House side of the Capitol Building.

The controversy raged for more than a month and it looked as though the Government might have to come to an end because it could not pass any essential appropriations to continue the functions of the Government merely because of the pride of the House Members in the House and the pride of the Senators in the Senate.

Eventually, the matter was resolved. Fortunately, a new wing had just been built in the Capitol, under the entrance, including a room equidistant from the House Chamber and the Senate Chamber. I believe the room number is EF-100. Thus, it was possible, in that room, for the senior members of the Appropriations Committees to meet. The House members sat on the House side of the Capitol and the Senate members sat on the Senate side of the Capitol, neither one under the jurisdiction of the other.

Thus, the troublesome controversy about where to meet on appropriation bills was resolved.

Mr. President, I would suggest that perhaps that precedent might serve as one idea for an appropriate meeting place, somewhere on the borders of the Iron Curtain or the Bamboo Curtain where our adversary is firmly in possession of one side and the United States could be firmly in possession of the other side. Each side could draw up its boundary line, or they could find a place where a nation is not trying to force one side

to yield to the other and agree upon some capital in a neutral nation, or anywhere else in a neutral nation as an adequate meeting place to hold the conference.

So with probably two-thirds of the area of the earth available for both sides to choose a meeting place, I would hope those powers in North Vietnam would agree with us on some reasonable, adequate, suitable, neutral meeting place. It could be at sea, anywhere on the high seas; it could be in some nation that would appear to be neutral with regard to the issues in contest; or it could even be in some nation that perhaps could be leaning toward the other side—provided that proper security and proper protection of the interests of the negotiators from this side could be guaranteed and secured.

So there is no real reason why that problem could not be resolved, and I look forward to the day when both sides will arrive at an agreement on a suitable meeting place. But we need not delay holding meetings to decide on a place where a peace conference could be held. That could be arrived at quickly and could be held almost anywhere.

RETIREMENT OF MAJ. ROBERT McLEAN FROM ASSOCIATED PRESS

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the directors of the Associated Press during its current meeting saluted Maj. Robert McLean as "a living symbol of the Associated Press—a personification of its ideals."

Major McLean yesterday retired as a member of the board of directors after 44 years of extraordinary service, including 19 years as president of the world's largest news-gathering organization.

Mr. McLean, chairman of the board of the Philadelphia Bulletin and the Santa Barbara, Calif., News Press, first was elected to the Associated Press board in 1926. The members reelected him 14 times to 3-year terms.

It was my privilege to serve alongside him as a member of the board of directors—and under his leadership as president—for 13 years. Never have I known an individual more dedicated to a cause than Robert McLean has been to the Associated Press and to the integrity and objectivity of its news report.

Robert McLean is, indeed, a living symbol of this news-gathering organization; he is, indeed, a personification of its ideals; he has, indeed, been a source of inspiration and confidence to his colleagues.

In speaking today of Robert McLean and his ideals, I want to broaden it to include the whole concept of a free press.

I speak as one who is convinced that democratic government and individual freedom cannot long exist unless its media of communication remain free.

I speak as one who is convinced that the media of communications cannot continually remain free without dedication to integrity and objectivity, and without having paramount the public interest.

Our Nation has two great news-gathering organizations, the Associated Press

and United Press International. It is important that we always have at least two strong competing nationwide and worldwide news-gathering services.

Over many years I have had close association with the directors, the management, and the talented personnel of the Associated Press; through the years I have had wide acquaintances among the reporters and the executives of United Press International.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 3 minutes of the Senator have expired.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I feel that our Nation is a better nation today—and a better informed nation—because of the aggressiveness, the initiative, and, above all, the integrity of AP and UPI.

Most of us in public life have from time to time had our quarrels with the press. Most of us at various times would like to have been quoted differently from what we were. Most of us are convinced, and I among them, that the communications media are not without their faults.

But I for one am convinced that, taken as a whole, those who toil in the vineyards of news gathering and dissemination are ably and conscientiously serving the public interest.

So as Robert McLean retires from 44 years as the director of the AP, I salute him, I salute him as a personification of the ideals of a free press.

DOCUMENTATION OF THE VESSEL "OCEAN DELIGHT"

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 10) to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Treasury to cause the vessel *Ocean Delight*, owned by Saul Zwecker, of Port Clyde, Maine, to be documented as a vessel of the United States with coastwise privileges.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 10) to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Treasury to cause the vessel *Ocean Delight*, owned by Saul Zwecker, of Port Clyde, Maine, to be documented as a vessel of the United States with coastwise privileges, which was, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, notwithstanding the provisions of Section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1920 and the provisions of Section 4132 of the Revised Statutes as amended the Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating shall cause the vessel *Ocean Delight*, built in Meteghan, Nova Scotia, and now owned by Port Clyde Packing Co., Inc., of Port Clyde, Maine, to be documented as a vessel of the United States, upon compliance with the usual requirements, to engage in the coastwise trade and the fisheries, so long as such vessel is owned by a citizen of the United States.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, S. 10 as amended by the House still retains the full intent and purpose of the measure as enacted by the Senate, and the amend-

ment made in the House is merely technical in nature.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Alaska that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

AUTHORIZATION FOR THE USE OF THE VESSEL "ANNIE B." IN THE COASTWISE TRADE

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I now ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1093) to authorize the use of the vessel *Annie B.* in the coastwise trade.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1093) to authorize the use of the vessel *Annie B.* in the coastwise trade which was strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, notwithstanding the provisions of Section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1920 and the provisions of Section 4132 of the Revised Statutes as amended the vessel *Annie B.*, owned by William M. Fifield of Stonington, Maine, may be used in the coastwise trade so long as such vessel is owned by a citizen of the United States and so long as it is used for the transportation of bait and supplies for the lobster and crab fisheries within the State of Maine.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, as was the case with regard to S. 10, this amendment is merely a technical amendment; and I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VOTERS WATCH DEMOCRATS ON RIOTS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a column by David Lawrence entitled "Voters Watch Democrats on Riots," which appeared in yesterday's issue of the Washington Star.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VOTERS WATCH DEMOCRATS ON RIOTS (By David Lawrence)

The American people will have an opportunity in November to vote for or against the Democratic party and pass judgment on the way it has dealt with the riots and disturbances in America.

Inasmuch as the Democratic party has been in control of the White House and the

Congress for the last eight years, the issue will be whether or not it has fulfilled its obligation to preserve law and order. "Peace at home" directly affects more people than "peace abroad."

Up till now, the usual alibi offered is that the states and the cities rather than the federal government have the major responsibility. The District of Columbia, however, is completely under the jurisdiction of the President and the Congress. In recent riots, several people were killed, many were injured, and large losses in property damage were inflicted upon the residents of the nation's capital. Although there are indications of planned operations to create disorder, prosecutions of such conspiracies have not materialized.

It is known that experts in making firebombs, as well as persons with criminal records, have been involved in the disorders. Some of the planning in the recent "disturbance" here called for diversionary maneuvers, designed to draw the police and federal troops away from the Capitol Building, as militants plotted to take over the Capitol Building itself. Only when large numbers of police and federal troops were spread throughout the area were the militants finally discouraged.

Sen. Russell Long, D-La., and majority whip in the senate, pledged in a television interview on Sunday to "keep a close watch" on the U.S. Department of Justice to see whether provisions in the recently passed Civil Rights Act concerning punishment for rioters will be enforced. He said:

"The provisions (in the law) will make the federal government help us do something about people that throw firebombs into a man's place of business or people who shoot at the policemen and firemen when they are trying to perform their duties."

Most of the persons killed and injured recently in the nationwide riots were Negroes. There has been a disposition nevertheless not to take vigorous action in handling the riots for fear of antagonizing large groups of Negro voters who, it has been assumed, might misinterpret firmness in dealing with disorders as merely opposition to displays or expression of opinion.

Communist organizations are believed to be in the background. It is to their interest to provoke as much discord as possible inside the United States. Some of the troublemakers have ties with Castro's Cuba and are directly or indirectly connected with Red Chinese agents who have been touring different countries in this hemisphere in an effort to stir up guerrilla warfare and carry on subversive acts.

The U.S. Senate Internal Security subcommittee charged in 1966 that the Communist party had played a key role in the campus revolts throughout the country. J. Edgar Hoover, director of the FBI, has described certain of the student clubs as "Communist-born." Many members of Congress suspect that a Communist angle exists in the plots and planned disorders. The theory is that, whenever a schedule of "demonstrations" is announced, the subversives prepare to move in behind the scenes. Then, when the marches and rallies occur, disorders break out in so many places that the police are unable to cope with them.

For a long time, it has been believed that Washington could be a model city because it has the benefit of close supervision by Congress and the President. Today, on the other hand, many residents of the District of Columbia are worried and apprehensive. The administration in power has the responsibility for maintenance of public order here. What it does in the next six months to expose the conspiracies behind the killing of innocent persons, the setting of fires and the looting of stores will be watched by the whole country. Failure to act will be an indication to the people that only an over-

whelming protest at the polls will wake up the politicians and convince them that public opinion doesn't want to see sociological reforms tackled on a large scale until after the security of the individual in American life has been assured.

CAN U.S. RIOT STRATEGY WORK AGAIN?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a column by Orr Kelly, entitled "Can U.S. Riot Strategy Work Again?" which appeared in yesterday's issue of the Washington Star.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAN U.S. RIOT STRATEGY WORK AGAIN?

(By Orr Kelly)

The nation's police and military leaders have found the perfect strategy for dealing with civil disorders in American cities. The only trouble is, the strategy might not work the next time around.

Within hours after the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. on April 4, elements of a carefully worked out military plan known as Operation Garden Plot began to go into effect, directed from the Army Operations Center at the Pentagon.

The theory behind Operation Garden Plot, applying lessons learned the hard way in Newark and Detroit last summer, was that a massive show of force would be sufficient to quell civil disturbances with a minimum loss of life.

Soldiers assigned to riot control duty received a wallet card listing nine special orders, including the following one, which emphasized the effort to avoid use of firearms:

"I will not load or fire my weapon except when authorized by an officer in person; when authorized in advance by an officer under certain specific conditions or when required to save my life."

In Washington, Baltimore and Chicago, where federal troops were deployed in large numbers, the approach worked.

Property loss, from fire and looting, was relatively high. But loss of life, especially in comparison with Detroit and Newark, was minimal.

The early imposition of a citywide curfew in Washington was also cited by Cyrus R. Vance, the former deputy defense secretary, as an important factor in restoring order without loss of life. This will undoubtedly be an important part of the new strategy if and when trouble breaks out again.

But at least some military officers who had an opportunity to observe the situation in several cities in the few days after the assassination are not at all optimistic that the strategy will work as well in the future as it appeared to work earlier this month.

The success the police and military achieved resulted from the use, under a carefully prepared plan, of disciplined forces in massive numbers (the division-sized force that rushed into Washington was larger than the allied force required to drive the Viet Cong from the city of Hue) against scattered, undisciplined groups of people acting without any apparent direction or plan.

Now, to see why the strategy that seemed to work so well might not prove so effective again, change that formula just a little bit.

Suppose there is even minimal planning for the arson, looting and rioting. Add a small number of disciplined leaders. Gather rioters in key spots so they cannot be effectively controlled without use of force.

With these rather small changes, a future

confrontation between rioters and the police and military could be far more bloody.

Loss of life would be particularly difficult to avoid if shots or grenades were directed at the police or soldiers from the midst of a mob in a deliberate and cynical attempt to create a bloody and inflammatory incident.

The problem would become vastly more complicated, too, if a small, disciplined group managed to disrupt police and military communications, or if fires were set in a pattern designed to overtax a city's fire-fighting capacity.

The debate over whether or not police should try to kill arsonists or maim looters misses the point.

A more meaningful question is whether the police and military could, if they were faced with a planned and disciplined effort to disrupt the life of a major American city, restore and maintain order without killing or wounding significant numbers of people.

It may be that the strategy of Operation Garden Plot can be adjusted to meet such a threat without serious bloodshed. But this month's experiences leave that question unanswered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY GEN. ERIK KRAUGH, MEMBER OF THE DANISH PARLIAMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, in the absence of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], who are away from the floor at the moment, I have been asked to present to the Senate, Gen. Erik Kragh, Conservative Member of the Danish Parliament. Mr. Kragh, a retired major general, has been attending a meeting of the North Atlantic Assembly's Standing Committee here in Washington. General Kragh is Denmark's representative on that committee.

I take great pleasure in announcing to the Senate that General Kragh is present, and I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess for 2 minutes, so that Senators may welcome this distinguished visitor. [Applause, Senators rising.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will stand in recess.

Thereupon, at 1:41 p.m., the Senate took a recess for 2 minutes, and General Kragh was greeted by Senators.

The Senate reconvened at 1:43 p.m., upon the expiration of the recess, when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. TALMADGE in the chair).

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 16409) to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1965 to provide salary increases for teachers and school officers in the

District of Columbia public schools, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

ADDITIONAL FACILITIES PROJECT PROPOSED FOR NAVAL RESERVE

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations), transmitting, pursuant to law, the location, nature, and estimated cost of an additional facilities project proposed to be undertaken for the Naval Reserve, Naval Air Station, Dallas, Tex., new water well; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

A letter from the director of the American Legion, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the financial condition of the Legion as of December 31, 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORTS OF THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the administration of Project Mohole by the National Science Foundation, dated April 23, 1968 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the need for improved communication between Army commands to avoid procurement of unneeded combat weapons systems, Department of the Army, dated April 24, 1968 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce, with amendments:

S. 913. A bill to amend part III of the Interstate Commerce Act to provide for the recording of trust agreements and other evidences of equipment indebtedness of water carriers, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1094).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 3368. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. John D. Noble, Jr., U.S. Air Force Reserve; and

S. 3369. A bill for the relief of Dr. Israel Castellanos Gonzalez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HICKENLOOPER (for himself and Mr. MILLER):

S. 3370. A bill for the relief of Hua-Ling Nieh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAYH:

S. 3371. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ramesh K. Kuba; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 3372. A bill for the relief of Antonio Carbone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 3373. A bill for the relief of Dr. Andres Raul Fernandez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 3374. A bill for the relief of Sabatino Contrisciani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGOVERN:

S. 3375. A bill for the relief of Blandina Salvador; and

S. 3376. A bill for the relief of Christina Bangcawayan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 3377. A bill to increase the limitation on the number of officers for the Coast Guard; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (by request):

S. 3378. A bill to provide for increased participation by the United States in the International Development Association, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. FULBRIGHT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. CASE):

S. 3379. A bill to designate certain lands in the Great Swamp National Wildlife Refuge, Morris County, N.J., as wilderness; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

S. 3377—INTRODUCTION OF BILL

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce, at the request of the Secretary of Transportation, a bill to increase the limitation on the number of officers for the U.S. Coast Guard.

Enactment of Public Law 89-444 increased the maximum number of authorized Coast Guard officers from 3,500 to 4,000. The 4,000-authorized-officer level will be reached in the near future due to the expanded role of the Coast Guard, including the deployment of forces in Southeast Asia. This bill would increase the maximum authorized limitation to 5,000 officers.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following my remarks there be printed in the RECORD the letter from the Secretary of Transportation to the President transmitting the proposed bill and a comparative type showing changes in existing law to be made by the proposed bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter and comparative text will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3377) to increase the limitation on the number of officers for the Coast Guard, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter and comparative type, presented by Mr. MAGNUSON, are as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION,
Washington, D.C., March 15, 1968.

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is transmitted herewith a draft of a proposed bill, "To increase the limitation on the number of officers for the Coast Guard."

The proposed bill would raise the limitation on the maximum number of officers,

excluding commissioned warrant officers, on active duty which could be authorized for the Coast Guard from four thousand to five thousand.

When the last increase in this maximum number was authorized, from three thousand five hundred to four thousand, with the enactment of Public Law 89-444, it was anticipated that the increase would accommodate planned growth until the 1970-1972 period. However, increased mission responsibilities of the Coast Guard including the deployment of forces to Southeast Asia and the transfer of new functions to the Coast Guard have combined with the expected growth to create a demand for personnel which exceeded original expectations.

As a result the existing limitation of four thousand will be reached in the very near future. In order to continue to meet immediate needs and provide a realistic ceiling for the foreseeable future, an increase in the maximum limitation to five thousand is necessary.

It should be observed that in itself, the proposed amendment will not result in an actual increase in the number of officers on active duty in the Coast Guard and therefore there are no costs associated with raising the limit. Actual increases will result only as program increases are authorized through the annual budget and appropriation process. Any additional officers allowed would parallel overall personnel strength increases authorized through the same process.

It would be appreciated if you would lay this proposed bill before the Senate. A similar bill has been transmitted to the House of Representatives.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection from the standpoint of the Administration's program to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely,

ALAN S. BOYD.

COMPARATIVE TYPE SHOWING CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW MADE BY THE PROPOSED BILL

(Matter proposed to be omitted is enclosed in brackets; new matter is in italics)

TITLE 14

§ 42. Number and distribution of commissioned officers.

"(a) The total number of commissioned officers, excluding commissioned warrant officers, on active duty in the Coast Guard shall not exceed [four] *five* thousand."

S. 3378—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO PROVIDE FOR INCREASED PARTICIPATION BY THE UNITED STATES IN THE INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for increased participation by the United States in the International Development Association, and for other purposes.

The proposed bill has been requested by the Secretary of the Treasury and I am introducing it in order that there may be a specific bill to which Members of the Senate and the public may direct their attention and comments.

I reserve my right to support or oppose this bill, as well as any suggested amendments to it, when the matter is considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the RECORD at this point, together with the letter from the

Secretary of the Treasury to the Vice President dated April 19, 1968, in regard to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3378) to provide for increased participation by the United States in the International Development Association, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3378

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the International Development Association Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 10. The United States Governor is hereby authorized (1) to vote in favor of the Second Replenishment Resolutions providing for an increase in the resources of the Association, and (2) to agree on behalf of the United States to contribute to the Association the sum of \$480 million, as recommended by the Executive Directors in a report dated March 8, 1968, to the Board of Governors of the Association. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, without fiscal year limitation, \$480 million for payment by the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States share of the increase in the resources of the Association."

The letter, presented by Mr. FULBRIGHT, is as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, April 19, 1968.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is transmitted herewith a draft of a proposed bill, "To provide for increased participation by the United States in the International Development Association."

In his foreign aid message, the President noted that the International Development Association, the World Bank's concessional lending affiliate, is almost without funds. He stated that "discussions to provide the needed capital and balance of payments safeguards are now under way. We hope that these talks will soon result in agreements among the wealthy nations of the world to continue the critical work of the Association in the developing countries. The Administration will transmit specific legislation promptly upon completion of these discussions. I urge the Congress to give it full support."

The Second Replenishment discussions have now been completed and the Board of Executive Directors of IDA has submitted a report and proposed Resolutions to the Governors embodying a specific proposal for replenishing the resources of the Association. The proposal calls for a total increase in resources of \$1.2 billion to be paid over a three-year period beginning in 1968. Other countries will contribute \$720 million and the U.S. share would be \$480 million—40 percent of the total—to be paid in three equal annual installments of \$160 million. This proposed \$160 million annual contribution represents a reduction of one-third from the FY 1969 Budget estimate of annual installments of \$240 million for the United States contribution to IDA. Furthermore, payment of the first \$160 million installment in FY 1969 and of the two further installments in each of the succeeding fiscal years is to be made in the form of a letter of credit and only a portion of the \$160 million would be reflected in actual cash expenditures in FY 1969. The

Second Replenishment proposal incorporates the balance of payments safeguards for the United States that we have regarded as essential. Until 1971 at a minimum, these safeguards will also result in a reduction of budgetary expenditures significantly below our annual commitment of \$160 million.

The draft bill would (a) authorize the U.S. Governor of IDA (1) to vote for the Resolutions providing the terms of the Second Replenishment, and (2) to agree to contribute the U.S. share of this replenishment, and (b) authorize the appropriation of \$480 million in order to make this payment.

The International Development Association was established in 1960 as an affiliate of the World Bank, to provide financing of development projects on easier repayment terms than the World Bank could provide. IDA's membership is divided into two classes: Part I countries, which are in a position to provide assistance to the developing countries; and Part II countries, which are still in the process of development. Initial subscriptions to the capital stock of the Association totaled \$767 million in convertible currencies and \$219 million in local currencies, and were paid in five annual installments over the period 1960-1964. The U.S. subscription was \$320 million.

The Part I countries contributed an additional \$750 million in convertible currencies over the three-year period 1965-1967. Congress approved a U.S. share of \$312 million—41.6 percent of the total. In addition, the World Bank has transferred \$210 million from its net income to the Association on a grant basis.

IDA credits have made a major contribution to the economic growth of the less-developed countries and the Association has achieved a high reputation for efficient and sound management of its resources. Since its inception, IDA has made 118 credits to 38 countries totaling \$1.7 billion for projects in transportation, agriculture, industry and education. Credits on IDA terms are essential if the pace of economic development is to be maintained and an intolerable debt burden on the developing nations is to be avoided. A replenishment of IDA will assure the continued flow of capital resources to developing nations on terms they can afford.

As of February 29, 1968, the Association committed \$1,741 million of its total convertible currency resources of \$1,793 million and thus had available only \$52 million. These funds will be fully committed by June 30, 1968. Unless the Second Replenishment Resolutions are adopted by June 30, IDA must cease making new commitments.

In March of last year, I was authorized by President Johnson to support a substantial IDA replenishment provided that account would be taken of the balance of payments problems of deficit donor countries in deciding how IDA's new resources would be made available. It is important that the Second Replenishment of IDA not impair the program to achieve equilibrium in our international accounts. The arrangements that have been negotiated to achieve this result.

The principal impact of the Second Replenishment balance of payments safeguards can be stated quite simply—the Second Replenishment will be managed for the next three years so as to avoid adding to any serious U.S. balance of payments deficit. In summary, the arrangements will provide that if identifiable procurement in the United States is less than our pro rata share of a draw down of our contribution, the difference would not be paid in and would be deferred for at least three years. To the extent of such deferment, cash expenditures at the time of deferment would be significantly less than our three-year annual commitment of \$160 million, although the deferred amounts would be called at a later time. There is no adverse balance of payments impact on the U.S. if disbursements to IDA are limited to an amount equal to pur-

chases of goods and services in the United States as a result of IDA credits.

Under the arrangements, no drawings at all may be made in excess of identifiable procurement until June 30, 1971. This was made possible by the willingness of some other countries, particularly some of the surplus countries, to allow accelerated drawings on their contributions in excess of their pro rata share. Only if this source of funds is used up, after June 30, 1971, the U.S. may be called upon for drawings in excess of identifiable procurement. Any amount that is deferred may not be called upon for three years regardless of whether the deferral occurs before or after June 30, 1971. The United States has represented its intention to waive these balance of payments safeguards when it considers its payments deficit no longer serious.

IDA must not be allowed to go out of business for want of funds. Prompt action by the United States is necessary in order to bring the Second Replenishment into effect by June 30. The continued successful operation of this multilateral financing institution is in our vital interest. The balance of payments safeguards incorporated into this proposal assure that our financial contribution will not have an adverse effect on our international accounts. I strongly recommend prompt enactment of this legislation.

A special report of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Policies relating to the proposed Second Replenishment of IDA resources will be transmitted to you and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

It would be appreciated if you would lay the proposed bill before the Senate. An identical bill has been transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that the proposed legislation would be in accordance with the President's program.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY H. FOWLER.

S. 3379—INTRODUCTION OF BILL RELATING TO GREAT SWAMP WILDERNESS AREA

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I introduce, for myself and Senator CASE, of New Jersey, a bill to place in wilderness status 3,750 acres of the Great Swamp in Morris County, N.J. An identical bill is being introduced today in the House of Representatives by Representative FRELINGHUYSEN, in whose district the Great Swamp lies. And the other 14 Members of the New Jersey House delegation are cosponsoring Representative FRELINGHUYSEN's bill. Thus the entire New Jersey congressional delegation is on record in support of this legislation.

I might add that, following hearings in Morris County last year, Stewart Udall, Secretary of the Interior, also has recommended this tract, which is now a national wildlife refuge, for inclusion in the wilderness system.

Mr. President, it may seem incongruous to some to create a wilderness area—where, by law, man may be only a temporary visitor and his works are barred forever—in the teeming New York metropolitan area. But I find nothing incongruous in it. Indeed, I find it entirely fitting that the Nation's most urban State should also be one of the first to have a wilderness area designated within its borders.

In urban and suburban New Jersey, man has reshaped the earth to his own needs and wishes. The skyscraper and

the jetport, the freeway and the shopping center have left almost no trace of the land that our fathers found but three short centuries ago.

The Great Swamp is the last sizable vestige, in northern New Jersey, of that natural heritage. It has resisted the encroachments of man to this point because of an accident of topography and geography. But even these features will not be sufficient to protect it from the bulldozers if we do not act now.

Only by legislative fiat can we now preserve the island of beauty and solitude in the midst of 30 million people. Already, the developers have turned acquisitive eyes on this tract. Presently, it is the Port of New York Authority which wants to build a giant jetport, but if that threat is turned back there will be another and another and another until, finally, the pressures of our growing population would overwhelm and overpower those who seek to preserve this island in a sea of concrete.

I shall not burden the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with the technical reasons why this section of the Great Swamp is deemed especially suitable for designation as a wilderness area. The Department of the Interior has amply documented these reasons and its report is readily available to those who wish to see it. Suffice to say that it more than meets all the criteria which have been established by the Congress and by the Department of the Interior.

Mr. President, I intend to ask the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], who is chairman of the Subcommittee of Public Lands of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, for an early hearing on this bill. It is relatively free of controversy—only three of more than 200 statements at last year's hearing were opposed to the measure—and I do not anticipate that the hearing would take more than 1 day.

At this point, I am optimistic that this bill can be reported favorably this year and that the Senate will have an opportunity to vote on its final passage before adjournment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3379) to designate certain lands in the Great Swamp National Wildlife Refuge, Morris County, N.J., as wilderness, introduced by Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. CASE), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I am glad to join with my colleague, Senator WILLIAMS of New Jersey, in introducing legislation to create the Great Swamp Wilderness in Morris County, N.J.

Identical legislation also is being introduced today in the House. It is indicative of the strong support for this bill that all of New Jersey's 15 Congressmen have joined in introducing it in their body.

The Great Swamp bill has been strongly supported by the Secretary of the Interior and recommended to the Congress by the President. It has the endorsement of the Governor, of other State and local officials in New Jersey, of businessmen, of conservationists, and of

thousands of interested citizens. When field hearings on the proposal were held last year, 6,212 individual letters and wires were received and all but two were in support of the wilderness area proposal for the Great Swamp.

The bill before the Congress is a simple one. It would place about 3,750 acres of the swamp in a national wilderness area. The area to be so protected includes sections of land known as the M. Hartley Dodge and Harding Wildernesses. At present these areas are part of the Great Swamp National Wildlife Refuge which is administered by the U.S. Department of the Interior.

Because the Dodge and Harding units are, in effect, "roadless islands" with unusual ecological features, and are within a national wildlife refuge, they qualify for protection under the Wilderness Act. This protection would preserve them in their present wild state forever. No buildings would be permitted. Access would be by foot or horseback only.

Wilderness area designations are the surest guarantee we have against encroachments on the natural wonders of our land. Such designations are made by acts of Congress and, therefore, can only be changed by Congress. This contrasts with national wildlife refuges which are created by a special commission and placed under control of the Interior Department. As past experience has shown, this protection, as good as it is, can be vulnerable to political pressures.

The Great Swamp needs all the protection it can get. Since 1959 the Port of New York Authority has sought to convince the public that the swamp is the ideal site for a new global jetport the port authority wants to build in the metropolitan area. I and others have strongly opposed location of a jetport in the Great Swamp. Largely because of this opposition, reinforced by the State legislature, the port authority proposal for the swamp has not gotten to first base.

The port authority proposal in 1959 did, however, trigger a nationwide effort to save the Great Swamp. More than a million dollars was collected and with it some 3,000 acres acquired for donation to the Federal Government as part of a Great Swamp National Wildlife Refuge. The refuge was established in May 1964 and eventually will consist of about 5,800 acres, including lands that are being purchased by the Federal Government.

More than half of the 5,800 acres will comprise the new wilderness area. The remainder of the refuge will continue to be managed by the Interior Department to enhance its use by migratory and nesting waterfowl.

Supporting it as it does a wide variety of plantlife and animal and bird species, the swamp is a priceless outdoor laboratory and classroom for scientists and scholars. In addition, it serves as a source of enjoyment for those simply interested in viewing the wonders of nature.

Moreover, the swamp is important to the water supply of the region. By holding runoff waters and releasing them gradually, the swamp exercises a beneficial influence on the level of the Passaic River. In this context, it is a natural

helpmate in the fight against flooding or pollution of the Passaic.

The Great Swamp is both "unique and the last of its kind," in northern New Jersey, according to the Department of the Interior. The swamp also has been described as an island of beauty in the midst of a sea of increasing urban ugliness. It is that and more. If Congress acts promptly, large portions of this unique natural wonder can be preserved untouched for the enrichment of present and future generations.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

ESTABLISHMENT OF A JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE ON OBSERVANCE OF THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF ARMISTICE DAY

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I submit today a Senate concurrent resolution establishing a joint select committee to make plans for the appropriate observance of the 50th anniversary of Armistice Day, which is celebrated in many areas of the United States as Veterans Day.

November 11, 1968, will be the 50th anniversary of the armistice which ended the "war to end all wars."

As we are engaged in the conflict in Vietnam, it behooves us more than ever to pay homage to the millions of veterans who have protected their country, many with the ultimate sacrifice, from aggression around the world in an attempt to bring peace and prosperity to the world as a whole.

The dissension and the debate which has racked our country over our involvement in Vietnam should never be allowed to dim the high sacrifices made by our veterans or detract from the worthy objectives of this Nation over the past half a century in defending freedom. It is, therefore, even more appropriate that we pause during this dissent and during this debate in our country to reflect upon our Nation's goals and to honor all veterans.

The concurrent resolution would establish a joint select committee of Congress composed of 20 members. Ten Members of the House of Representatives would be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and would be divided equally among members of the two parties. The other 10 members would come from the Senate and would be appointed by the President of the Senate and would be divided equally among members of the two parties.

The committee would be directed to submit to Congress, no later than July 1, 1968, its recommendations as to the manner in which the Congress might give appropriate public recognition to the 50th anniversary of Armistice Day, together with such additional recommendations as the committee might consider useful with respect to concurrent observations by other departments and establishments of the Government, by the several States, by organizations of veterans, other patriotic organizations, and community groups.

It is my hope that should such legislation be enacted and should the com-

mittee report be adopted, our country would recognize this important anniversary with a general closing of all businesses so that the entire Nation may pause to pay homage to the veterans who made that day possible.

The importance of this 50th anniversary celebration was called to my attention by an old friend, Ray Gallagher, of Redfield, S. Dak., the present junior vice commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States. Mr. Gallagher, who is a past commander of the South Dakota Veterans of Foreign Wars, accurately stated that such legislation should be supported in an attempt to impress upon our Nation the importance of our undertaking in Vietnam as well as recognition for past sacrifices by our veterans.

I ask unanimous consent that this concurrent resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the concurrent resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 71) was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 71

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That November 11, 1968, being the fiftieth anniversary of the date of the armistice which concluded hostilities in the armed conflict now known to history as World War I, there is established a joint select committee to make plans for the appropriate observance of this anniversary by the Congress, which committee shall be known as the Joint Select Committee on Observance of the Fiftieth Anniversary of Armistice Day (hereinafter in this concurrent resolution referred to as "the committee").

SEC. 2. The committee shall be composed of 20 members selected as follows:

(1) Ten Members of the House of Representatives appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to be divided equally among members of the two parties; and

(2) Ten Members of the Senate appointed by the President of the Senate, to be divided equally among members of the two parties.

(b) Any vacancy in the committee shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment was made.

SEC. 3. The committee shall elect a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

SEC. 4. The committee is authorized to procure necessary clerical assistance and office supplies and to utilize the services of the departments and establishments of the Government.

SEC. 5. As promptly as may be practicable, but not later than July 1, 1968, the committee shall submit to the Congress its recommendations as to the manner in which the Congress might give appropriate public recognition to the fiftieth anniversary of Armistice Day, presently celebrated in many areas of the country as Veterans' Day, together with such additional recommendations as the committee might consider useful with respect to concurrent observances by other departments and establishments of the Government, by the several States, and by organizations of veterans other patriotic organizations, and community groups.

SEC. 6. The expenses of the committee shall be paid equally from the contingent funds of the House of Representatives and the Senate on vouchers signed by the chairman or the vice chairman of the committee.

SEC. 7. Within thirty days after November

11, 1968, the committee shall make a final report to the Congress, on submission of which report, the committee shall cease to exist.

RESOLUTION

AUTHORIZATION OF PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF COMMITTEE PRINT ENTITLED "PLANNING-PROGRAMING-BUDGETING: SELECTED COMMENT"

Mr. JACKSON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 280); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 280

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Government Operations five thousand additional copies of the committee print entitled "Planning-Programing-Budgeting: Selected Comment", issued by that committee during the Ninetieth Congress, first session.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 706

Mr. HOLLINGS submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 724) for the relief of certain individuals, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that public hearings have been scheduled for Wednesday, May 1, 1968, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2300, New Senate Office Building, on the following nominations:

June L. Green, of Maryland, to be U.S. district judge, District of Columbia, vice Burnita S. Matthews, retired March 1, 1968.

John H. Pratt, of Maryland, to be U.S. district judge, District of Columbia, vice Alexander Holtzoff, retired December 31, 1967.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearings may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and myself, as chairman.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON TAX CONVENTIONS WITH FRANCE AND THE PHILIPPINES

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I wish to announce that a public hearing has been scheduled on the tax convention with France (Ex. N. 90-1) and the tax convention with the Philippines (Ex. D. 89-1). The hearing will be held at 10 a.m., Tuesday, April 30, 1968, in room 4221, New Senate Office Building.

Persons wishing to testify on either of these conventions should get in touch with Mr. Arthur M. Kuhl, the chief clerk of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

MISSIONS OF MERCY AND ACTS OF COMPASSION BY THE PEOPLE OF CICERO, ILL.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, during these times of tension among segments of our citizenry, there seems to be a tendency to highlight or emphasize every act of opposition, ill feeling, and mischief, with little recognition of Christian concern and civic contributions in times of crisis in certain communities such as that experienced in Cicero, Ill.

I believe it would be remiss to fail to mention publicly these missions of mercy and acts of compassion. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the letter of thanks to the people of Cicero by Rev. Henry Mitchell, director of the North Star United Missionary Workers of America, 1257 South Pulaski Road, Chicago, Ill., as it appeared in the April 17, 1968, issue of the Life newspapers.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A GRATEFUL NEGRO CLERGYMAN WRITES THANKS TO CICERO

(NOTE.—The following letter came to the Life Newspapers yesterday from the Reverend Henry Mitchell, director of the North Star United Missionary Workers of America, 1257 S. Pulaski rd., Chicago.)

To the Good People of Cicero:

It gives the North Star United Missionary Workers of America great joy to say "thanks" for the many blessings that you have bestowed upon our Negro community in time of our crisis.

It has been proven to the Negroes on the west side of Chicago that the people of Cicero care more for the poor people than many, many middle class income Negroes.

While Stokely Carmichael was telling Negroes to arm themselves with weapons and go out into the streets and kill all white people, the people of Cicero were arming themselves with clothes and food to give to the Negro community.

Every day we are opening our doors to distribute food and clothing to the poor and the needy. Before we let anyone in, I stand on a milk case and remind them of the sayings of Stokely Carmichael.

After reminding them recently of his statement, I asked them to let me see the hands of those to whom Carmichael has given their babies a can of milk, food, clothing or furniture?

Not one hand was raised. I asked them, "Who was their friend? Those that say 'get out in the streets and kill white people' are not those who feed them and clothe them in time of need."

There was a cry as never before saying, "They came to our rescue!"

The negro, along with the North Star organization, cannot find words to thank the leaders, business people and the community of Cicero for the good things that they have done for us. All we can say is "May God Forever Bless You."

After I saw the trailer loaded with clothing and food, knowing that God had blessed some hungry boy or girl, I could not hold back the tears of joy.

Last but not least, we would like to give special thanks to Atty. Christy Berkos and Sean O'Gara of the Life Newspapers for spearheading this program.

Rev. HENRY MITCHELL,
Director.

MILITARY WASTE?

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. President, last Friday, after several days of debate—an

unusual amount of time to be given to a Defense procurement bill, the Senate approved S. 3293 authorizing a total of some \$21.3 billion for that purpose. That measure was, of course, only a part of the swollen Defense Department spending package that we will be asked to consider this year.

Proposals to make significant reductions in that measure were routinely defeated—although we did take a hopeful first step by imposing a reduction of roughly 3 percent. By and large we continued to apply a separate standard to outlays by the Department of Defense compared with expenditures by other agencies of the Government.

Over the weekend, shortly after the bill was passed, United Press International reported an announcement that serves as a painful question of the Pentagon's ability to handle the taxpayers' money wisely.

According to that report, the Pentagon has let contracts for the purchase of 120,000 M-16 rifles. Harrington and Richardson Co., of Worcester, Mass., will produce 60,000 and General Motors Corp., of Ypsilanti, Mich., will provide exactly the same number. Yet one contract is for \$15 million, and the other is for \$19 million—a difference of \$4 million.

The UPI indicated that the Pentagon was unable to explain the difference in prices.

Mr. President, we will have an opportunity to explore this subject more fully when Defense Department appropriations are brought up for consideration. I hope that in the interim we will hear a meaningful explanation of this shocking disclosure from the Department of Defense. I have requested an explanation of the matter in a letter to Secretary Clifford.

I ask unanimous consent that the press report be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

M-16 RIFLES ORDERED BY PENTAGON

The Pentagon announced yesterday contracts to purchase 120,000 lightweight rapid-fire M-16 rifles from two new producers as part of its program to equip South Vietnamese and additional U.S. forces.

Coit's Inc. has been the sole producer until now.

The Pentagon announced a \$15 million contract to Harrington & Richardson Co., of Worcester, Mass., for 60,000 rifles, and another \$19 million contract to General Motors Corp., Ypsilanti, Mich., for 60,000 rifles. The Pentagon said it was unable to explain the difference in prices.

Both contracts were for the first year of a multiyear program.

The U.S. will provide M-16's to the additional American forces to be deployed in Vietnam. It is also giving them to South Vietnamese regular forces and South Vietnamese militia known as regional and popular forces.

THE TELEPHONE STRIKE

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, an interesting editorial concerning the present telephone strike was published in the Washington Post of Tuesday, April 23.

The article fairly and thoughtfully outlines the position of the two parties and concludes with the following statement:

We hope that the large measure of restraint and good judgment which have been shown on both sides will bring the dispute to an early and equitable settlement.

I sincerely hope that both the workers and management will heed this admonition and resolve their differences with fairness and expedition. Accordingly, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TELEPHONE STRIKE

The country appears to have taken the telephone strike in stride. Though nearly 200,000 telephone workers have been out since last Thursday, telephone service has been widely maintained, thanks largely to the dial system. No national emergency has arisen, and there is substantial hope for a settlement without a prolonged struggle.

The contest is officially confined to the wage issue, as other provisions of the contract have 18 months to run. We get the impression that both management and the union are acting responsibly, although it appears to have been a mistake of judgment for the company to seek injunctions aimed at the strike in Alabama and Kentucky. The company had previously offered to resume negotiations and had talked favorably of the union idea of putting aside the present 18-month contract and seeking an entirely new three-year agreement, instead of dealing only with the wage issue. If they proceed on this basis, the negotiations will be more complicated but the outcome might be more satisfactory.

There is much other evidence of genuine collective bargaining. Before the strike began the union had made five different proposals to the company. For its part the Bell Telephone System claims to have made the largest wage offer in its history. It is said to be an increase of 7.5 per cent over 18 months or 5.4 per cent on an annual basis, which is close to the ceiling recommended by the Administration for the sake of stability. The union is said to be asking 10.5 per cent.

No doubt it will be difficult to close this gap, but it certainly should not be impossible. According to Joseph A. Beirne, president, the Communication Workers voted 17 to 1 to authorize a strike even though they have no substantial strike fund. Apparently they feel deeply about the wage issue, although Mr. Beirne insists that the union's position is fluid.

One other posture taken by the union has won it much sympathy. Mr. Beirne was asked whether he did not now regret having acquiesced in development of the dial system. In reply he insisted that his response would be the same if he had to meet the problem again tomorrow. "Some things come ahead of the union," he said. "Your country."

We hope that the large measure of restraint and good judgment which have been shown on both sides will bring the dispute to an early and equitable settlement.

EDNA FERBER: A GREAT LADY

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, the Anchorage, Alaska, Daily News of April 19 published a tribute to Edna Ferber, written by George Sundborg, administrative assistant to my colleague from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING]. Mr. Sundborg

was one of those Alaskans who became acquainted with Miss Ferber while she was giving thought to writing a book about Alaska. With him as with others, that acquaintanceship ripened into friendship as Miss Ferber set herself to the task of writing a book which was published under the name "Ice Palace" and which many of us believe had an important part in the winning of the fight for Alaska statehood.

Mr. Sundborg has only praise for Miss Ferber. He describes her as "a great lady." With this judgment I concur without qualification. Miss Ferber had a sharp and incisive mind. She had an almost uncanny ability to "read" people, and with it all hers was a fine sense of humor.

Mr. President, yesterday I was talking with Senator GRUENING about Mr. Sundborg's tribute to Miss Ferber. At that time he reminded me of his early association with her and more specifically related how it was that she came to write "Ice Palace." Senator GRUENING had gone into this in his recently published book, "The Battle for Alaska Statehood," from which I quote:

In the closing weeks of the 2nd Session of the 85th Congress, we got an unexpected break. Edna Ferber's book: Ice Palace, appeared in March of 1958. I had gotten Edna to write this book which followed an acquaintance we had struck up some years before when she utilized a passage from my book: Mexico and Its Heritage, published in 1928, as the theme for one of her stories, which later became the title of the book that included that short story. It was entitled: They Brought Their Women.

In describing the differences between the early history of North America and Latin America, the former being settled, the latter conquered by people from the Old World, I had written as follows:

"The diversity between the two cultures south and north of the Rio Grande is sharply discernible in the respective status of their women. The North American settlers brought their women. The squaw-man was outcast. The exalted position of woman in the American ideology dates from the pioneer days of companionate hardship and effort . . . The Aztec female, on the other hand, played the part of handmaiden to the warrior male."

Edna Ferber wrote me that she was going to use this as the title of a short story and did so. Having been an admirer of her fiction for some years, I suggested to her that she ought to write a novel about Alaska, and told her of our problems and our desire for statehood. She became interested and made several trips to Alaska to get the necessary background.

Ice Palace made a strong case, in fiction form, for statehood. Some of the literary critics felt it was not up to her best work but one of them referred to it quite correctly as "the Uncle Tom's Cabin for Alaskan Statehood." Thousands who would never have been interested in any of our pro-statehood non-fiction magazine articles, of which I had written several for Harper's, the Atlantic Monthly, Current History, the New York Times Magazine Section, etc., did read novels.

In the closing weeks of our statehood drive, scores of people asked me whether I had read "Ice Palace." It was called to the attention of many Congressmen by readers who were also their constituents. I have no doubt that it changed quite a few votes.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Sundborg's article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article

was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A TRIBUTE TO EDNA FERBER

(NOTE.—Our guest columnist, George Sundborg, a former Alaska editor and publisher, is Sen. Ernest Gruening's administrative assistant.)

(By George Sundborg)

A great lady who has been described as the Harriet Beecher Stowe of the battle for Alaska statehood died Tuesday in New York. Edna Ferber with her book "Ice Palace" struck a blow for statehood at a time when the attention which the novel centered on Alaska may well have been decisive. It was in a similar way that "Uncle Tom's Cabin" 100 years earlier steered national determination to abolish slavery.

Miss Ferber's connection with Alaska was neither brief nor accidental. In the early 1950s her perceptive mind told her that an issue worthy of her time and attention probably existed in the efforts of Alaskans to attain full self-government under the American flag. Edna came to Alaska quietly not just once but three or four times on far-ranging trips.

Someone in Washington—I think it was then Delegate Bob Bartlett—had given her my name. On her first day in Alaska at Juneau she invited Mrs. Sundborg and me to have cocktails with her and without betraying any purpose proceeded to ask us a few hundred piercing questions about the Territory, its problems, its people, and its hopes for the future.

Miss Ferber was by no stretch of the imagination a pretty person. She was, in fact, almost grotesquely ugly. But so keen was her intelligence and so great her wisdom that I always thought of her as beautiful.

After she returned to New York from initial travels around the Territory I began to receive brief, pointed letters from her. Where should she go in Alaska to see a fish trap in operation? What salmon cannery would be representative and how would she get to it? What interests and people were opposing statehood and where should she go to try to understand their reasons?

After the second or third trip I mentioned in a column which I wrote for the little weekly newspaper in Juneau, of which I was then publisher, that Edna Ferber was undoubtedly gathering material for a novel about Alaska. She had subscribed to the paper, as I am sure she did to many newspapers in Alaska. That she read them carefully was attested to by prompt receipt at the office of the Juneau Independent of a letter taking me to task for drawing conclusions from her Alaska activities which she herself had never voiced or, according to claim, even determined upon.

But eventually a novel was written. We had become quite good friends by the time she was ready to confess that this was the fact. She told me that the final revision had to be done from a hospital bed in Arizona, where she had gone for treatment of a horribly painful affliction known as trigeminal neuralgia, sometimes called "the suicide disease."

"Ice Palace" met with a mixed reception in Alaska. Miss Ferber, in a manner which many literal-minded Alaskans could not accept, had scrambled half a dozen communities together to form one she called Baranof, which was the main scene of the action of her story. Although this mythical city was described as on an inlet with mountains all around, it was easy to recognize that in most street-by-street detail and in spirit the community was undeniably Fairbanks.

Not only places but times and persons were telescoped in the book. It could well be that the main issue of statehood and self-government was overstated in "Ice Palace" just as

the issue of slavery was drawn too crudely in "Uncle Tom's Cabin."

To me it seems that "Ice Palace" contains some simply wonderful vignettes of Alaska life. There is a description of the lobby of what has to be the Nordale Hotel in Fairbanks which is an absolute gem. Numerous characters in "Ice Palace" are obviously modeled on actual Alaskans.

The author found a gracious way too of flattering some of her Alaska friends by dropping their names into the dialogue. Thus I am able to impress bystanders at any point where I can get my hands on a copy of "Ice Palace" by turning to a page in which the heroine declaims: "Not if you knew the Alaskans I mean. Paul and Addie Barnett (fictional characters) and George Sundborg—he's an editor in Juneau—and the Atwoods in Anchorage and Herb Hilscher and Eva McGown in Fairbanks, and the Nordals and Bob Bartlett our Delegate, he's just the most wonderful—and Ernest Gruening—he was our Governor, you know, no, you don't know, I suppose."

Those who haven't read "Ice Palace" shouldn't judge it by the simply atrocious motion picture of the same name which was more or less based upon the novel. Edna herself couldn't understand why Hollywood did what it did with her books. She thought the movie "So Big" was so awful that she refused to go and see "Ice Palace" or any of the later ones. The one Ferber novel from which a really good motion picture was made was "Giant," but Miss Ferber wouldn't go to see that either.

The movie "Ice Palace" committed such atrocities as having Robert Ryan get off his salmon seining boat in a port which looked like Petersburg in summer and mashing by dog team directly into an Arctic blizzard which had to have been swirling through Anaktuvuk Pass. Edna Ferber was not guilty of such gross betrayals of nature and geography. Everyone who knew her was aware that she understood and loved Alaska.

Not many years ago in New York City I was walking along Park Avenue past a number which I recognized as the address on Edna Ferber's letters to me. It was a very rich apartment building. I phoned up from the street and she insisted I come up for luncheon and a visit. She talked entirely about Alaskans we both knew, exhibiting a keen memory and interest. It was the last time I was to see her.

It is my impression that Edna Ferber, for all her great success, probably lived a very lonely life. She never married. She was in manner withdrawn, almost shy—this despite the positive way in which she could voice opinions about events and issues.

I think I admired her as much as anyone I ever met. She was unfailingly kind and generous even to those she knew only slightly.

I would like to end this tribute to the truly great lady who died this week by telling a story never told until now about one of her kindnesses of which I was the beneficiary.

When I was struggling with financial problems connected with publishing my weekly newspaper I received unsolicited a check from Edna Ferber for \$1,000. "Dear George Sundborg," she wrote—she always addressed me in just this way—"I was talking about you with Bob Bartlett today and he told me he thought you could use this." Could I? It looked to me just then like all the money in the world.

When, a few years later, I sold the publishing enterprise and sent Edna a check for the original \$1,000 plus some modest sum in interest, she sent it back promptly with a note saying to "Dear George Sundborg" that she had never considered this a loan but rather a gift to a dear friend and that she had forgotten about it long ago. She added that she was sure I needed the money more

than she did, and I could not argue with her about that.

Edna Ferber undoubtedly has many friends in Alaska who are having some of the same thoughts I am having about her this week. She gave to Alaskans and to everyone so much more than she took. We miss her already.

THE GUN TRAFFIC

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, shortly the Senate will be taking up the safe streets and crime control bill. Title V of the bill contains a limited, modest, conservative gun control provision, designed primarily to limit access to handguns by criminals, juveniles, and the insane. The bill is basically concerned with concealed weapons. It imposes no unreasonable burdens on hunters and sportsmen and no burdens at all on domestic sale and purchase of rifles and shotguns. The amendment is the least Congress can do to meet the critical need and growing public demand for effective gun control.

The American people are fed up with the unlimited gun traffic in this country. They are grievously disappointed in congressional failure to take any action to keep concealed weapons out of the hands of criminals, juveniles, and the insane.

The American people want action now to control the gun traffic in this country. Americans want guns kept away from felons, children, and the mentally deranged. Americans want an end to the incredible condition we face in this country when any idiot, 10-year-old, or escaped convict can order a gun by mail in any State in the Union with total anonymity and impunity.

In fact, the American people, the President's National Crime Commission, J. Edgar Hoover, and police officials across the Nation all want legislation to compel registration of all firearms sales in this country.

Gun owners and non-gun-owners alike recognize that the presently virtually unlimited gun traffic threatens every law abiding American. In a series of public opinion polls during the past 2 years, both the Gallup and Harris organizations have found increasing public clamor among gun owners and the general public alike for rigid firearms control. In September 1966, Gallup reported 68 percent of all Americans favored legislation making a police permit a prerequisite to any gun purchase. A Harris poll released yesterday morning shows public support for registration of all gun sales has risen to 71 percent. That poll shows that three out of every four Americans favor Federal legislation to control the sales of guns, "such as making all persons register all gun purchases no matter where they buy them."

Most gun owners themselves support Federal firearms control, including registration, to an increasing degree. In September 1966, Gallup reported that 56 percent of all gun owners favored registration. By September 1967, this support had risen to 66 percent of all gun owners. Yesterday's Harris poll shows gun-owner support of Federal laws compelling registration remains at the two-thirds point, two out of every three gun owners favoring registration.

While congressional action on the gun

traffic has been stalled by the vocal, but relatively small, band of gun lobbyists, the American people have become increasingly critical of a Congress which cares more about the members of the NRA than the rest of the people of the United States of America. A Harris poll 3 months ago of this year indicated that the major cause of a 5-year low in public confidence in Congress is congressional failure to pass gun control legislation. Almost half of all citizens interviewed put congressional inaction on guns as the major cause for their loss of confidence in Congress.

The course the public expects from Congress is clear. The American people want the gun traffic brought under reasonable control. The modest, stripped-down gun control measure the Safe Streets Act contains is a minimum step to meet this longstanding and urgent public demand.

I believe title IV of the Safe Streets Act in fact falls short of adequately protecting the public interest. It contains no control at all over the domestic sale of rifles and shotguns. These weapons, which account for up to 30 percent of all gun crimes, will still be freely available over the country and by mail order over the country in every State in the Union.

But we need, at long last, a gun bill. Title IV of the Safe Streets Act is the first real gun bill taken up by the Senate in 30 years. Congress should not miss this chance to protect the American people.

I ask unanimous consent that the public opinion polls of the past 2 years on public attitudes on gun control be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE HARRIS SURVEY—CONFIDENCE IN CONGRESS AT LOW EBB, PRESIDENT NOW HAS HIGHER RATING

(By Louis Harris)

Public confidence in Congress has reached its lowest ebb in five years, with the American people giving the recently reconvened 90th Congress at 41 to 59 per cent negative job rating.

In fact, President Johnson, with a positive rating of 43 per cent, now is more favorably received by the public than is Congress.

Specific criticisms of last year's session are directed at failure to pass a gun control bill, cutting back aid to cities, not passing an open-housing law and cutting funds for the poverty program.

The House and Senate are credited for refusing to pass the income tax increase requested by the President, for increasing Social Security benefits, for extension of the draft and for cutting back funds for foreign aid.

Basically, the public's unhappiness with Congress stems from a feeling that in a time of crisis in Vietnam, racial turmoil at home and a rising cost of living, Congress has bogged down in cantankerous debate over peripheral issues and has not come up with a legislative program to meet urgent problems.

Here is the trend of confidence in Congress as measured in the last part of 1967, compared with similar readings over the past five years. A cross section of 1620 households selected on a careful probability basis across the country was asked:

"How would you rate the job this session of Congress (90th Congress) has done—excellent, pretty good, only fair or poor?"

Trend of confidence in Congress

[Percentage]

	Positive	Negative
1967	41	59
1966	54	46
1965	71	29
1964	64	36
1963	35	65

Those with no opinion, 1 per cent, have been eliminated from this table in order to compare trends with other years.

The drop in esteem for Congress since the flood of Great Society legislation in 1964 and 1965 has been precipitous.

Significantly, people who voted for Barry Goldwater in 1964 are far more critical of Congress (2 to 1 negative) than those who voted for President Johnson four years ago (51-49) per cent favorable. This would indicate that the criticism of Congress is likely to work more against Mr. Johnson than his Republican opponent in this year's presidential election.

Among key groups in the electorate, independent voters, the better educated and younger people are most critical. Negroes and enrolled Democrats tend most to defend the record of Congress.

Specific assessment of legislative action by the 90th Congress showed these reactions by the cross section:

SPECIFIC RATINGS OF CONGRESS

[In percent]

	Positive	Negative	Not sure
Increasing social security benefits	55	30	15
Refusing to pass a tax increase	54	26	20
Cutting back foreign aid bill	43	34	23
Passing an extension of draft law	41	25	34
Cutting back the antipoverty program funds	34	45	21
Not passing an open housing law	33	38	29
Cutting back aid to the cities	29	41	30
Not passing gun control legislation	28	48	24

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Apr. 22, 1968]

TIGHT GUN RULES FAVORED 71 TO 23

(By Louis Harris)

By 71 to 23 per cent, the American people favor that passage of Federal laws that would place tight controls over the sale of guns in this country. These latest results mark a five-point rise in support of a gun control legislation from last August.

Such legislation has been before Congress for over a year, but the measure has encountered strong opposition from the National Rifle Association.

Significantly, people who own guns favor gun control laws by 65 to 31 per cent, better than a 2-to-1 margin.

The number of homes in which occupants say they have guns has now reached a majority, with 51 per cent reporting gun ownership. The largest incidence of acknowledged gun ownership is found in rural areas, where 78 per cent possess a gun; in the South, with 64 per cent, and small towns where 58 per cent own a gun in the household, compared with 32 per cent among Negroes.

Despite the heavy sentiment in favor of gun control legislation, the number of gun owners who say that they would use their weapon to shoot other people in case of a riot has risen from 29 to 51 per cent since last August. The reasons can be found in additional questioning which found that 48 per cent of all adult Americans now say they are personally more uneasy on the streets as a result of fear of racial violence.

Many added that in the absence of gun control and other measures, they felt they

had no alternative but to resort to measures of self-protection.

A cross-section of 1634 homes was asked this question on gun control legislation:

"Do you favor or oppose Federal laws which would control the sales of guns, such as making all persons register all gun purchases no matter where they buy them?"

[In percent]

	Favor	Oppose	Not sure
Nationwide	71	23	6
East	70	20	10
Midwest	69	27	4
South	71	22	7
West	77	22	1
Own gun	65	31	4
Don't own gun	79	13	8
Whites	71	23	6
Negroes	69	23	8

The patterns of gun ownership shows wide variation by region, size of place, and by race:

"Do you or does anyone in your house own a gun?"

[In percent]

	Own gun	Don't own gun
Nationwide	51	49
East	34	66
Midwest	55	45
South	64	36
West	53	47
Cities	27	73
Suburbs	47	53
Towns	58	42
Rural	78	22
All whites	55	45
Whites under \$15,000 income	47	53
All Negroes	32	68
Negroes under \$15,000 income	36	64

Last August and again in this latest survey, all gun owners were asked:

"Would you or a member of your family use your gun to shoot other people in case of a riot or not?"

[In percent]

	March	August
Would use gun	51	29
Would not use gun	32	62
Not sure	17	9

Students of gun usage under combat and other conditions of stress emphasize that there might be a wide divergence between a person's expressed willingness to use a weapon and his actual behavior when confronted with an actual shooting. So it is undoubtedly an overstatement to conclude that better than half of all gun owners today would actually use their weapons against other human beings.

But, the willingness to say they would shoot other people in case of a riot is symptomatic of the tension that exists in this country today. Another question illustrated this apprehension:

"Does the fear of racial violence make you feel personally more uneasy on the streets or not?"

[In percent]

	Uneasy	Not uneasy	Not sure
Nationwide	48	47	5
Cities	56	39	5
Suburbs	52	43	5
Towns	34	62	4
Rural	46	48	6
All whites	46	50	4
Whites under \$15,000	48	49	13
All Negroes	58	30	12
Negroes under \$15,000	60	31	9

Fear of physical safety due to possible outbreaks of racial violence runs higher among Negroes than whites, and highest among lower income Negroes.

In the absence of other measures, some Americans clearly have taken to arming themselves with guns. Unquestionably, however, the vast majority of people in this country would much prefer to see steps taken to curb violence. And one key step, nearly three out of every four feel, would be to have Congress pass gun control laws now.

THE HARRIS SURVEY

(By Louis Harris, Sept. 16, 1967)

A national survey indicates that 27 million white Americans, representing 54% of the nation's homes, own guns. A majority of gun owners say they would use their weapons to "shoot other people in case of a riot." Large numbers of white people in this country have apparently given serious thought to self-protection, and one person in every three believes that his own home or neighborhood might be affected by a riot.

It would be a mistake, however, to conclude from this evidence that most whites welcome the idea of unrestricted arms. To the contrary, by a decisive 66-to-28% margin, white gun owners favor passage of a law in Congress which would require that all persons "register all gun purchases no matter where they buy them."

Gun ownership shows wide variants by regions of the country:

Gun ownership among whites [Percentage]

	Own	Don't own
Nationwide	54	46
By region:		
East	33	67
Midwest	63	37
South	67	33
West	59	41

Gun ownership is concentrated more in the South and the Midwest than in other parts of the country. The East, where the fewest own guns is also the area where gun owners would be least willing (46%) to use their firearms against fellow citizens.

The cross section of white gun owners was asked:

"Would you use your gun to shoot other people in case of a riot?"

Use gun to shoot people in riot [Percentage]

	Gun owners Would use	Not use
Nationwide	55	45
By region:		
East	46	54
Midwest	54	46
South	58	42
West	59	41

The willingness to use guns against other people seems to be related to white gun owners' attitudes toward a national firearms control law. Although a majority in the South and West favor such legislation, the percentages in favor are less than in the East and Midwest.

The cross section of white gun owners was asked:

"Do you favor or oppose federal laws which would control the sale of guns, such as making all persons register all gun purchases no matter where they buy them?"

REGISTRATION OF ALL GUNS

[In percent]

	Favor	Opposed	Not sure
All white gun owners	66	28	6
By region:			
East	70	21	9
Midwest	70	25	5
South	62	27	11
West	56	40	4

Clearly, the spate of civil disorders over the past summer has raised people's fears for their safety. This was evident in the replies of the special cross section of whites to this question:

"Do you fear that in a riot your own home or neighborhood might be affected?"

MIGHT BE AFFECTED BY RIOT

[In percent]

	Might be	Not be	Not sure
Total whites	34	58	8
By income:			
Under \$5,000	41	49	10
\$5,000 to \$9,999	33	60	7
\$10,000 and over	32	62	6

Low-income whites, many of whom live in fringe neighborhoods alongside Negroes, are most apprehensive.

It should be pointed out, however, that earlier Harris Surveys reported that when both Negroes and whites were asked how they feel about their personal safety on the streets, Negroes were far more anxious than whites. Fear of violence does not seem to show any color line.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 14, 1966]
THE GALLUP POLL: GUN OWNERS THEMSELVES
FAVOR CURBS

PRINCETON, N.J., September 13.—Few issues spark such heated reactions as gun controls, and few issues are so widely misunderstood.

Some of the opposition to the registration of guns comes from those who think that this would mean banning all guns. Actually, the law proposed would not prohibit a person from owning a gun—either for sport or protection—but would require that a record be made of the name of the gun purchaser. The purpose of such a law would be to keep guns out of the hands of persons with a criminal record, the mentally disturbed and others unqualified to handle weapons.

The mood of the public for nearly three decades has been to impose controls on the sale and possession of weapons.

The survey questions and findings:
"Would you favor or oppose a law which would require a person to obtain a police permit before he or she could buy a gun?"

[Percentage]

	All persons	Gun owners
Yes	68	56
No	29	41
No opinion	3	3

Those who favor such a law:

1. Too many people get guns who are irresponsible, mentally ill, retarded, trigger happy, criminals.
2. It would save lives.
3. It's too easy to get guns.
4. It would be a help to the police.
5. It would keep guns out of the hands of teenagers.

Reasons of those who oppose such a law:

1. Such a law would take away the individual's rights.
 2. Such a law wouldn't work—people would still get guns if they wanted to.
 3. People need guns for protection.
- "Which of those three plans would you prefer for the use of guns by persons under the age of 18— forbid their use completely, put restrictions on their use, or continue as at present with few regulations?"

[Percentage]

	All persons	Gun owners
Forbid use	27	17
Restrictions on use	55	59
Continue as at present	15	22
No opinion	3	2

THE RESPONSE TO HUNGER REVELATIONS

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, there have been two responses to the report of the Citizens Board of Inquiry on Hunger and Malnutrition in the United States from distinguished sources that I would like to call to the attention of the Senate.

I am extremely pleased by both of them, for both indicate an awareness of an ill-advised attack in the report on agricultural agencies and programs, but neither was diverted from the urgency of the inexcusable hunger which exists in the United States.

The first of these two responses was by Secretary of Agriculture Orville S. Freeman, who outlines where we have progressed on food aid programs in recent years—and there has been progress—and calls attention to the need for legislative authorizations and funds to do a better job.

The second is an editorial in this morning's Washington Post, which, I am pleased to observe, agrees with my statement Monday that the report entitled "Hunger, U.S.A." was excessive in its indictment of agricultural agencies and programs, but also calls for approval of the resolution which I announced Monday to establish a Senate Select Committee to study the problems of unmet human needs in our affluent society.

I am happy to advise the Senate that more than 20 Senators have added their names as sponsors of the resolution, which will be formally submitted Friday, and the original sponsors—Senators MONDALE, BOGGS, HATFIELD, and I—will welcome others. Senators are invited to call my office to join in sponsoring the resolution.

There is one statement in the Washington Post's splendid editorial on which I would like to comment. The Post defends farm programs aimed at assisting farmers for it is one of the very few metropolitan daily newspapers which has made the effort to study and get a real understanding of their purpose and need. The editorial refers, correctly, to farmers who earn \$20,000 or more each year. I wish to point out, however, that the \$20,000 figure is gross earnings, not net. The \$20,000-a-year farmer can very well be going broke when his expenses for gasoline, fertilizer, feed, interest, taxes, and many other items have been deducted from that gross. Few are netting half that much.

But it is a fine editorial, and the Post's enlightenment in relation to agriculture is both appreciated and a real service to the national interest.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the RECORD Secretary Freeman's statement in response to the "Hunger, U.S.A." report, and the Post editorial.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Office of the Secretary, Apr. 23, 1968]

STATEMENT BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE ORVILLE L. FREEMAN, ON RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE BOARD OF INQUIRY INTO HUNGER AND MALNUTRITION IN THE UNITED STATES
Many of the findings of the Board of Inquiry into Hunger and Malnutrition in the

United States parallel findings of Department of Agriculture studies and my own personal observations on field trips to hunger areas. The feelings of Board members at the disgraceful paradox of hunger amidst plenty are my feelings also.

So I welcome this group to what has often been a lonely battle to eradicate hunger in this Nation. Public awareness and public support of our efforts to feed the hungry are two commodities that have been in short supply over the past seven years. But despite this, more progress has been made in this period than in the preceding 25 years.

Because the Board of Inquiry's report overlooked this progress, and because the sharpness of its attack reflects upon the literally hundreds of thousands of persons—federal, state and local officials, volunteers who work in it—I believe it is important that we outline in some detail the very real successes we have had in meeting this problem.

When I became Secretary of Agriculture in 1961, only 1,200 counties (out of 3,091 in the Nation) had a food program. It consisted of the distribution of five surplus commodities worth about \$2.20 per person per month. Only 3½ million people were reached. President Kennedy's first executive order doubled the amount and increased the variety of these foods.

Surplus distribution provided only non-perishable foods and could not provide foods adequate to a balanced diet. By executive order I established a pilot food stamp program that allowed the poor to purchase a variety of foods in grocery stores. The Congress later made the program permanent and vastly enlarged it.

Today 2,200 counties have food programs, two-thirds of the counties in the U.S. Today, 5.8 million people are being fed, nearly double the number 7 years ago.

Those still on direct distribution now receive 16 different foods worth four times the amount they received in 1961. Food stamp recipients multiply their food dollars by \$15 million a month, \$180 million a year, in additional food purchasing power. They have a much more nutritious diet than is possible with direct distribution.

Compared to the peak year of direct distribution, 1962, when \$253 million was being spent to feed the poor, this fiscal year \$360 million is being expended in direct distribution and food stamps, a 70 percent increase in funds.

Although this progress is substantial, we realized it was not enough. So over the past nine months this Department has:

1. Gained commitments from local government to begin food programs in about 200 of the 330 poorest U.S. counties.
2. Extended food assistance to another one million people.
3. Reduced the amount needed for food stamps to 50 cents per person per month for the poorest of the poor.
4. Cut the payment in half for first month participants.

Reaching the remainder of the Nation's poorest counties has our top priority. In some of these areas local authorities refuse to cooperate. Ten days ago we initiated direct federal distribution of food in one of these counties, Elmore in Alabama, when we were unable to get a commitment from local government to administer the program. Similar action will be taken next month in a number of other counties. In addition, we are now paying all or part of food program administrative costs in many poorer counties that are cooperating.

We would do even more if we had money to do it with. We have reached our budget limit during this fiscal year on extending food stamps to more persons. Extension of the program to more people would mean reducing the amount of bonus stamps to persons already in the program.

The Department is now working to eradicate hunger to the limits of its budget; its available manpower and the legal framework in which it must operate. It is seeking new authority to allow it to better do its job of feeding the hungry, and welcomes the active support and participation of the Board in this endeavor.

This social ill is a great deal more complex than a simple lack of food. It is compounded of unemployment, lack of education, discrimination and a centuries-old culture of poverty that the Nation has only recognized in the past few years, to say nothing of attempting to solve.

Some of the Board's 14 recommendations are being accomplished now. For instance, USDA already is training 900 non-professional aides, recruited from the poor, to work in nutrition and in informing the poor of their rights under the stamp program. Eligibility for—and the amount of—food stamps are now keyed to income and number of dependents, as the Board suggests. We now have special feeding programs, including a breakfast program, for schools in low-income areas; for Head Start and other non-school feeding.

We do not, however, have all the authority that this Administration has asked for.

Accomplishing most of the Board's 14 recommendations will take new legislation and several billions of dollars from the Congress. Many of their ideas are workable and would help the Nation meet its commitment to the poor.

When and if they are presented to the Congress I will look forward to giving in full the Department's views on them.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 24, 1968]

HUNGER IN AMERICA

The Citizens' Board of Inquiry into Hunger and Malnutrition in the United States has performed a public service by its appraisal of the problem of malnutrition in this country. Its eloquent and dismaying picture of the effects of dietary deficiencies in this country ought to produce at least some indicated improvements in state, local and federal administration of existing programs. Better yet, it should stimulate a re-examination of our whole approach to this problem.

It is unfortunate, however, that the committee went so far afield into agricultural policies never intended, except incidentally, to deal with this problem. Were the committee to succeed in bringing about the abolition of the major and basic farm programs, which it criticizes, farm income would drop 60 to 70 per cent, there would be more rural poverty than ever and there would be no Government food programs at all.

The committee criticizes the farm programs for not achieving welfare purposes they were not designed to achieve and blames an acreage retirement program for giving large payments to those who have large acreages—a logically inevitable result. It complains that farmers earning more than \$20,000 a year get 54 per cent of total farm payments; but farmers in this category produce 54 per cent of all sales of farm produce and so are sharing proportionately.

This is a kind of criticism of the acreage adjustment programs that has been made since they started. It is based on a confusion about the object and purpose of these programs which the committee's own distorted history further beclouds.

None of this detracts from the social importance of the committee's findings about nutrition. Hunger on the scale they have disclosed should not be tolerated in this country. It is an aspect of the larger problem of poverty as a whole. As Willard Cochrane, economic adviser to the Secretary of Agriculture, pointed out in 1965:

"Rural poverty has become a hard-core phenomenon. Poverty begets poverty in a

vicious circle. To date, policies and programs designed to cope with this social cancer have been too little, too late. They assist a family here and there, provide a few new jobs here and there, but they have not come to grips with the hard-core poverty problem—with the millions of men and women who grow up, marry, raise more children, and die in poverty. These millions live out an existence contributing little or nothing to the daily operation of society and the economy, and exert a positive drag on the development of society and the expansion of the economy."

Cochrane put a \$20 billion price tag on a program to deal with poverty. The country, so far, has found it too expensive. Senator George McGovern of South Dakota has proposed a Senate inquiry by members of the Agriculture, Labor and Public Welfare Committees with an added five other members, to re-examine the whole spectrum of poverty programs. It is a good idea. The Senate ought to approve it.

MILITARY PROCUREMENT AUTHORIZATIONS—ANNOUNCEMENT OF POSITION ON AMENDMENTS

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I was unable to be present in the Senate during the consideration of four amendments offered to S. 3293, authorizing certain appropriations for the Department of Defense, and of two amendments offered to H.R. 14940, authorizing funds for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on all six amendments. These amendments were offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] to limit authorizations for research and development to \$7,366,600,000; by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON] to reduce by \$342.7 million authorizations for missiles; by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] to bar use of funds for deployment of an anti-ballistic-missile system until the Secretary of Defense has certified to Congress that the system is practicable and its cost can be determined with reasonable accuracy; by the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] to weigh as a favorable factor in awarding defense contracts the undertaking by a contractor to employ a substantial number of unemployed or low-income persons thereon; by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] to authorize \$33 million for ACDA for 3 years; and also by Senator CLARK, to authorize \$20 million for ACDA for 2 years.

A MEMORIAL TO DR. MARTIN KING

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, in the aftermath of the tragic assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, thousands of citizens around the country expressed not only shock and grief but their concern that substantial action be taken by the Congress and executive branch in the wake of his death.

Among those were more than 3,000 members of the Yale community in New Haven, Conn., who signed a petition sent to the offices of the congressional delegates from Connecticut. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the petition be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the petition was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We who are members of the New Haven and Yale Community are grieved at the death of Dr. Martin Luther King. We do not believe, however, that mere expression of grief is a satisfactory atonement and homage for his death. The history of civil rights legislation over the past twelve months has been informed by neither reasonable prudence nor humanity, but represents an utter travesty of justice. We urge you that a fitting and necessary memorial for Dr. King is the immediate passage of legislation which will guarantee the personal dignity and constitutional rights of every human being in this land.

PASSENGER TRAIN SERVICE

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. President, anyone who has ever had to take a train during the past 10 years owes a tremendous debt of gratitude to John S. Messer of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. Messer's ruling, announced yesterday, that railroads must maintain minimum standards of service for passenger trains is heartening and gives some hope that sometime it may once again be enjoyable to take the train.

It is my hope that the full Commission will adopt Mr. Messer's ruling and recommendation at its earliest opportunity.

If Mr. Messer's ruling is adopted, it will mean that passenger trains must be clean, that they must provide proper heating and air conditioning, that long-distance trains provide dining-car and sleeping-car service, and that the railroads will no longer be permitted to downgrade service and standards deliberately in an effort to make fewer and fewer people take the train.

American passenger trains are notorious for their lack of service and comfort. And the time will soon come when the skies over the United States will reach a saturation point as more and bigger planes compete for the traveler's dollar.

High-speed rail service still provides the best hope for moving large numbers of passengers over great distances.

Mr. Messer's ruling is a first step in what may well become a new "get tough" policy with the Nation's railroads.

It is about time that something were done to improve and expand railroad service. Today's ruling comes about 10 years late; nevertheless, it is a welcome ruling and a hopeful sign for the future.

ADDRESS BY HON. FRANK M. COFFIN IN HONOR OF DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, Hon. Frank M. Coffin, of Portland, Maine, circuit judge on the U.S. Court of Appeals, delivered the principal address at a memorial service for Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., at Portland High School on April 7.

Judge Coffin's remarks sum up the dilemma both blacks and whites face in the race issue, and his remarks accurately describe the special problems of responsible white Americans in working to resolve the issue.

I ask unanimous consent that Judge Coffin's remarks be printed in the RECORD, because I think every American,

whether living in the metropolitan centers of the Nation or in rural communities, can become better neighbors and citizens by understanding the dilemma as described by Judge Coffin.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE FRANK M. COFFIN AT THE MEMORIAL SERVICE FOR DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR., PORTLAND HIGH SCHOOL, PORTLAND, MAINE, APRIL 7, 1968

When a great man dies in the evening of his years, the world pauses in mingled sadness and gratitude for his gifts to humanity. So we felt about Einstein, Schweitzer, and Pope John.

When such a man dies in the ripeness of his powers, the world grieves over its unmeasurable loss—as it did over Dietrich Bonhoeffer, Adlai Stevenson, and Dag Hammarskjöld.

When such a man is cut down by the hand of a deranged assassin, the world bleeds and its heart aches—as it did over Lincoln, Gandhi, and John F. Kennedy.

But when such a man is struck down by an assassin who pulled the trigger of a hate and a hardness of heart which are products of our times and ourselves, do we have the courage, the candor, and the love to give meaning to our mourning?

If our mourning is not to slide into an easy and cheap sentimentality, this should be a time of honesty, purification, and dedication. We have been selective in our grief and in our memory. Who recalls Mr. and Mrs. Harry Moore, the Florida NAACP leaders killed over a decade ago? or Reverend George Lee? or even Medgar Evers? And how many of us were perhaps relieved when violent death came to Malcolm X? I suspect that the purity of the grief of the white moderate today is tainted by his anguish that the apostle of non-violence has been snatched away.

Only twelve days ago Dr. King dared to say in restless Harlem: "We need an alternative to riots and to timid supplication. Nonviolence is our most potent weapon." This was comfortable doctrine. Even those who had criticized Dr. King for his earlier associations or for his opposition to government policy in Viet Nam came to look on him as the only buffer between us and ugly violence. We applauded his stand. We even sensed that it jeopardized his continuing leadership. But we never asked ourselves: what does it take on our part to make Dr. King's "militant nonviolence" a workable principle?

I am afraid that we looked on this as a one way proposition. We felt it reasonable to demand patience and restraint from Dr. King's 22 million constituents, not so much in order that progress be speeded but that we avoid a backlash which could undo our gains. The front page of our morning paper was a lesson in irony. The banner headline at the top read: "More violence scars America." A smaller headline at the bottom read: "Open Housing Seen Eroding Liberty." The story told of opposition in Maine to the modified open housing provisions of the civil rights bill based on the fear that passage would bring a repressive backlash.

What we do not realize is that nonviolence is not acting as human beings normally act under pressure, insults, deprivation, and often the application of brute force. Dr. King's way required tremendous discipline, subordination of the self to indignities, and a surpassing faith in the ultimate power of love to bring about not so much victory as reconciliation. We asked all this. In return we had to say that if we were to avoid a tax increase, other expenditures were more urgent than those for education and poverty programs. As nearly as we could, we wanted

to conduct business as usual. But Dr. King's brand of nonviolence is far from conduct as usual. It is sacrificial. And for it to have a ghost of a chance of succeeding, it must be matched by an equally militant and sacrificial response.

We are, as a nation, at a watershed. For we are tempted to respond to the illegal violence of minorities by asserting the legal violence which a majority can always impose. Even before the tragedy of April 4, observers of the American scene were fearful of a swing of the national pendulum to a society, in Robert Lowell's words, of "piety and iron." This danger is now more acute. But Dr. King's death must make it clear that the healing way is for the majority now to share the burdens of self purification, patience, and restraint. At least for a time white people can not expect their efforts to be greeted with gratitude. At least for a time we must labor without the satisfaction of being loved. Our own love will be put to the acid test by working for bitter people who will not trust us, who will call us "Whitey" with contempt, and will refuse the hand of fellowship. This will wound liberal egos. But to ask that we swallow insults, yet patiently and in good spirit work more energetically for a society of equal opportunity and dignity for all, is no more than what Martin King has always asked of his followers.

We in Maine may feel remote from Memphis, Birmingham, Montgomery, and even Washington, Detroit, and Chicago. By and large, we like to think of ourselves as a relaxed, tolerant, and fair people. It is easy for us to be sympathetic, open hearted, and understanding. But whatever our parlor talk, it is easiest to be blandly indifferent to the canker of discrimination which still exists in our own state and communities. For we are not free of the impurity that struck down Dr. King.

Our body politic, if one looks closely, has its running sores. We would like to shut our eyes to our blighted Indian compounds, to our tattered pockets of rural and urban poverty, to a genteel, stabilized, unostentatious, and accepted discrimination against both Jew and Negro. And, despite the splendid brotherhood among the leadership of our faiths which brings us together today, we still have a residual amount of patronizing condescension if not intolerance. Whether our symptoms are ugly eruptions on the surface or a low grade infection within, the disease is the same—man's inhumanity to man.

In closing, I can do no better than use the words which Dr. King used at the death of President Kennedy. In a prophetic way they are even more applicable to Martin Luther King than to President Kennedy. He said:

"We were all involved in [his] death. . . . We tolerated hate; we tolerated the sick stimulation of violence in all walks of life; and we tolerated the differential application of law, which said that a man's life was sacred only if we agreed with his views. . . . We mourned a man who had become the pride of the nation, but we grieved as well for ourselves because we knew we were sick. . . . If [his] tragically premature end . . . will prove to have so enlarged the sense of humanity of a whole people, that in itself will be a monument of enduring strength."

The time is now; the place is here.

CANDIDATE NIXON SHOWS RARE COURAGE

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, in yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I notice that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] has placed a series of editorials and articles commending Dick Nixon on his campaign positions. Senator HRUSKA in his own remarks especially com-

mended the former Vice President on his candor and courage in refusing to join the current mania for seeking to win votes by spending the taxpayers' money for any and every project which tends to meet a need, postpone a problem, or offer some hope of providing the candidate with blocs of voters come next November. Dick Nixon courageously said:

I refuse to play the game that way.

Nixon's wise statesmanlike statement is a sharp departure from prevailing trends and judging from the audiences I have addressed recently and the volume of correspondence I am receiving, it has impressed and encouraged a great segment of American feeling which is sick and tired of grandiose promises to spend glittering gold extracted from the taxpayers to promote the political interests of either an ambitious candidate or his political party. Certainly, if the Nixon example is followed by others, it may well usher in a new day in American politics, which in itself would greatly diminish the present perils of disastrous inflation. Promising to spend the other fellow's dollars on personal political preferment is not the watermark of statesmanship.

I join the many others who are congratulating Dick Nixon on this bold and brave renunciation of the dismal but frequently successful formula of "spend, spend, and spend" and "elect, elect, and elect." I hope that all other candidates for the Presidency will reexamine their campaign appeals and follow the salutary standards which Nixon has established for his own campaign.

Indicative of the widespread editorial support commending Dick Nixon on his statements in Minneapolis and elsewhere, which reject the concept of trying to buy the votes of citizens with their own money, and to win their support by reckless and unredeemable promises of a gay and untroubled tomorrow for everybody, is an editorial from the Deep South, where respect for the dollar and for thrift has long been evident in many quarters. I allude to an editorial published in yesterday's edition of the *Roanoke, Va., World-News*. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CANDIDATE NIXON SHOWS RARE COURAGE

Political cartoonists' namecalling and opposition jibes to the contrary notwithstanding, Candidate Richard M. Nixon grew tremendously in stature last week as he insisted on talking sense to the American people in the midst of partisan whoopla which at times was almost nauseating.

First of all, the former Vice President made an extraordinary impression Friday in Washington as he talked extemporaneously on national and world problems to an assemblage of newspaper executives noted for hard-nosed appraisal of politicians and their motives.

It was Saturday at Minneapolis, however, that Nixon earned the right to brand new respect when he pitched into the current cultivation of Negro votes by labelling "pie in the sky" promises of massive federal financial spending "dishonest and a cruel delusion."

Without mentioning names, he charged that the ghetto dwellers have been misled and "taken to the mountain top" from

whence they "have looked into the valley of despair."

What was he talking about?

Here's the way he put it:

What we are talking about now is an immediate financial crisis. And for any candidate or any political leader to come before the American people and tell a group of the poor, a group of people in poor housing, a group of people who want jobs, that right now the federal government is going to massively increase its spending program—that's dishonest and it's a cruel delusion to whom it's told.

And I'm just not going to join that game, whether it costs the election or not.

The nation is engaged in the war—the third bloodiest foreign war in history—and it simply does not have the billions of dollars to spend as suggested by the President's Commission on Civil Disorders, even if this were the proper answer, which is open to considerable doubt.

Administration action, taken in concert with other nations, to halt the run on gold and to stabilize the U.S. dollar, has been only a temporary remedy for the crisis which Nixon mentioned. Congress is aware that there must be severe cutbacks in federal spending to accompany imposition of a stiff tax surcharge if the budget is to be balanced and the dollar slide halted altogether.

Enactment of appropriations in the multi-billions on the domestic front before the Vietnam war can be brought to an end would perpetuate deficit financing and lead to almost certain disaster.

Offering instead a program of his own for "job banks" and bringing private enterprise into the slum areas to provide decent jobs for Negroes, the former Vice President quite obviously was laying his candidacy on the line.

Until now in the campaign, such candor and honest approach has been entirely lacking. On the Democratic side, both Sen. Kennedy and Sen. McCarthy have been too busy with their campus visitations to tackle the subject at all. Preoccupied with the war, President Johnson has dodged it and has avoided comment on the Commission report. Vice President Humphrey, who may announce this week, speaks glibly as usual but fine phrases do not solve situations.

Surely it must be dawning on Negro leaders that they have not been getting the truth and nobody can know better than they that the mere spending of money is not the answer to the anguish of their people.

Mr. Nixon displays rare courage at a time when demagoguery is rampant. Unless we miss our guess, the American people are in a mood to listen. If his frank and open stand compels his rivals of both parties to face the subject with candor there is hope that as a nation we shall do more than just try to muddle through.

A VITAL CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUE IS AT STAKE

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, recently the U.S. Tariff Commission reported to the Senate Finance Committee its views concerning Senate Concurrent Resolution 38, which declares it the sense of Congress that the International Antidumping Code, signed at Geneva on June 30, 1967, is in conflict with the American domestic law, the Antidumping Act of 1921 as amended.

The Commission report took cognizance of this conflict and noted the serious constitutional implications raised by the Executive's lone action in altering present standards and procedures for making determinations of the unfair

trade practice of dumping. In a speech before the Senate on April 4 I outlined the major conclusions of the report and again recommended that we take action to insure this matter be handled in the correct constitutional manner.

I would like now to bring to the attention of my colleagues a letter by Norman Garland which appeared in the *Washington Post* for April 20, 1968, under the title "Dumping Code Flap." Mr. Garland, recognizing the constitutional significance of the Executive's usurpation of congressional authority, is replying to a recent *Post* editorial which had essentially taken the position of the administration that we should get on with implementation of the code in spite of the legal and constitutional questions involved.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Garland's letter may appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DUMPING CODE FLAP

In an editorial appearing in *The Washington Post* on April 11, you discussed the "Dumping Code Flap" and expressed views which surprised me. The editorial shows a misunderstanding of the U.S. domestic-law definition of dumping, the economic definition and impact of dumping, and the effect of the new International Antidumping Code upon international trade. Even more important, however, is the editorial's failure to recognize the main issue in the "Dumping Code Flap."

The U.S. Tariff Commission, in one of its most carefully considered reports of recent years, objectively and fully analyzes the Code, comparing it with the U.S. Antidumping Act. A majority of this body, charged with enforcement of a part of the Antidumping Act, has concluded that the code is in direct conflict with U.S. domestic law. Assuming this conclusion to be correct, the Executive Agreement which the U.S. entered into with the other nations which were parties to the Code, would be held invalid and ineffectual in our courts. It is not, as you allege, "unfortunate" that a majority of the Tariff Commission is of this view; rather, it is unfortunate that the Administration chose to enter into such an agreement without being absolutely sure that such agreement was in strict conformity with U.S. law. A vital Constitutional issue is at stake: Whether the President and the Executive branch has the power to contravene the law of the land by mere executive fiat.

To suggest that the International Antidumping Code is good and therefore justifies U.S. participation, is to pull oneself up by one's bootstraps. If the Administration has not acted properly, its difficulties cannot be cured by labeling all those who disagree "protectionists." Nor can the fundamental issues be blithely ignored in the name of free trade. Nor should the Executive branch proceed with probable unconstitutional actions rationalized only by the self-serving declaration that the courts can later untangle the matter.

Dumping is viewed as the antithesis of free trade in most nations. Dumping constitutes an unfair trade practice in international trade, and under U.S. law has been found to be harmful with or without a conspiracy or predatory intent. Economists nearly unanimously agree that dumping disrupts free trade. In fact, U.S. businessmen could be heavily fined and might even go to

fall for doing in domestic trade what some types of dumping do in international trade. While bringing an unfounded charge of dumping might very well constitute a non-tariff trade barrier, dumping itself is a far more pernicious barrier to free trade.

NORMAN M. GARLAND.

WASHINGTON.

NBC'S PROGRAM, "MAN AND THE SEA"

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, the National Broadcasting Co., as part of its series on the future, presented on April 19 a 1-hour program entitled "Man and the Sea."

The program was a vivid portrayal of the exciting prospects the sea holds for man in the coming decades. It presented objectively the progress we have made in exploiting the resources of the oceans and the technological and political problems that remain to be solved if man is to realize the full potential of the oceans in the future.

I was particularly pleased, Mr. President, at the recognition given in the program to the international legal uncertainties that exist in regard to ownership and jurisdiction over ocean resources. It was indeed these same uncertainties that led me last month to introduce in the Senate a draft Treaty on Ocean Space. I find it most encouraging that these international problems are gaining wide public recognition.

As one who has a deep interest in the development of this country's oceanologic programs, I want to commend the television network, the producer of the program, Mr. Craig Fisher; Mr. Stan Rosak, codirector with Mr. Fisher; and Mr. Frank McGee, the narrator, for a very competent presentation of a broad and complex subject. By focusing attention on both the prospects and problems of ocean development, NBC has made an important contribution to public understanding.

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE ADDRESSES THE ANNUAL LUNCHEON OF THE ASSOCIATED PRESS

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an interesting and thought-provoking address by Hon. Clark M. Clifford, Secretary of Defense, before the annual luncheon of the Associated Press last Monday be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY CLARK M. CLIFFORD, SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, BEFORE ANNUAL LUNCHEON OF THE ASSOCIATED PRESS, NEW YORK CITY, APRIL 22, 1968

Mr. Miller, ladies and gentlemen, I consider my presence here today to be particularly appropriate from a personal standpoint.

Not only have I received generous and sympathetic treatment by the press, but, from time to time, I have profited greatly by individual contacts with prominent members of your profession.

I recall clearly, although it was almost twenty-five years ago, when I first arrived in Washington, that I had an important conversation with the then Dean of the Washington correspondents.

I said, "Sir, I want to be a success here, and I have been told that the best thing to do—is just be myself."

He studied me for a few moments, and then said, "Young man, you have been given very bad advice."

It is seven weeks today since I first walked into my office at the Pentagon and assumed the duties that fall to the ninth Secretary of Defense. I knew then that the duties were to be arduous, not only from my own past experience in government, but also from my close reading of the newspapers which were unstinting in their advice to the ninth Secretary, and in their warnings—and even, on occasion, in their compassion.

I had learned from the columnists and analysts that the eighth Secretary of Defense had been a gentle, even lovable Dove—who was stepping aside for a bloodthirsty old Hawk, me.

Knowing that the credibility of these writers is beyond question, I worried with as much sincerity as I could muster, about the dreadful things that I was about to do.

The newspapers told me of many other problems that I was facing. One story out of Saigon summed up Vietnam for me:

It said, "From the mist-shrouded northern highlands to the swamps of the Ca Mau Peninsula the news is bad—all bad."

I was told that "My Pentagon" was using up all the nation's gold, that I would shortly send another 200,000 soldiers to the war, and that the office elevator wouldn't work.

Needless to say, I wasn't the least bit discouraged. With the help of my many advisors—even including those working for the government—I was sure that I could at least get the elevator working.

Although I would wish to speak to you today under any circumstances with as much candor as possible, there now exists a particularly compelling case for me to do so, without concern over possible political implications.

That reason is the selfless and personally noble decision of President Johnson voluntarily to remove himself as a candidate for re-election this year. He has taken this action in order that he can deal more effectively with the peaceful resolution of our problems, both in this country and in the world.

It was an unprecedented act of Presidential patriotism.

His personal renunciation of a legitimate political aspiration in the cause of peace evidences a concept of duty in the highest tradition of our American system.

History will, I predict, rank this extraordinarily able man in the top echelon of our Presidents—not only for this unique disregard of private ambition, but because no President in this nation's history has accomplished as much in the fields of civil rights, education, public health, poverty, housing and urban development, and conservation and environmental improvement.

As a personal matter, I am grateful to him for the opportunity to serve his administration.

The day before yesterday I returned from my first meeting with the Defense Ministers of the Nuclear Planning Group of the NATO countries held at The Hague.

This was an exceedingly valuable experience for me personally, for it constituted a dramatic illustration of the effectiveness with which we can work together with our allies in planning a joint defense against possible future aggression.

I was impressed by the open and free discussion among nations that have a common aim in finding solutions to problems in an atmosphere of mutual confidence and trust.

It was clear to me that from this meeting there emerged a better collective understanding of the role that various nuclear weapon systems could play in the event of

an emergency. The presence of both nuclear weapons and conventional forces constitutes a flexible response which presents a strong deterrent to any would-be aggressor.

Apart from the formal agenda, I had the opportunity to talk privately both with my Defense colleagues and with other Europeans who had no official status. I found that many Europeans had questions similar to those that are raised in this country. And their questions, sometimes asked obliquely and sometimes quite directly, centered upon this one basic subject: Is American really in trouble? They wondered whether somehow we had become a stumbling giant, unable to cope either with our own most pressing domestic problem or with our most acute international involvement.

Our European friends were troubled, as our own people at home are troubled, by the current strife in our cities and the status of our efforts in Vietnam.

They are asking whether we have lost the formula for continuing our social progress without unleashing a volatile and fiery inferno of civil disorder.

They are asking there, as many are asking here, whether we are bogged down in Vietnam, struggling in a conflict that we can neither win nor abandon, at the expense of our ability to cope with our other obligations and responsibilities throughout the world.

I gave them the answer I want to give to you today. America is not in trouble. It is steady on its course. It is making progress. Of course we have not yet solved all our problems, either foreign or domestic, in Vietnam or in the cities.

I find this a source of neither humiliation nor embarrassment. No nation in history has ever solved all the problems of humanity. We in the United States have every reason to be proud of our record. This nation has never been, and is not now, a stumbling giant. Throughout our history, it has had the faith and the courage and the willingness and the ability to face its problems, to meet its challenges and work towards solutions of its difficulties.

The problems of the past have not been overcome without a price and without pain.

The problems of today—those facing us both in the jungles and rice paddies in Vietnam and in the aging and crowded centers of American cities—will cost us dearly.

But let the pessimists and the doubters always remember this: We have the resources and determination to surmount these obstacles.

You are due a progress report on our problems, and I would like today to begin with a report on Vietnam.

In Europe and here at home, some people continue to ask why we have concerned ourselves in what they term the backwaters of Asia. And they wonder whether this involvement in what they regard as an internal Vietnam conflict is inconsistent both with our traditions and with our over-all national interest.

They ask questions which are even more basic. They ask whether we can ever win or even disengage from Southeast Asia with our national honor intact.

My first answer is that I believe deeply in the necessity for our presence in Vietnam. We are assisting that brave and beleaguered nation to fight aggression, under the SEATO Treaty and for the same reasons that we extended our aid to Greece and Turkey over twenty years ago.

This is in the tradition of the Truman Doctrine which announced twenty years ago that we would help defend the liberty of peoples who wished to defend themselves.

Where, some ask, is the America of the Marshall Plan?

It is in South Vietnam today carrying on

the same tradition. It is providing economic aid to help put that resolute country back on its feet. The Marshall Plan performed precisely the same mission for the war-shattered countries of Europe. And I might stress that some of those countries have no larger a population—and indeed some are even smaller—than the country of South Vietnam.

We went into South Vietnam in force in 1965—when it was on the verge of being cut in half by Hanoi's intervention. We went in to save the people of South Vietnam, when other nations would not, and they could not.

We went into South Vietnam in force to provide a shield behind which the people of South Vietnam could gradually strengthen themselves.

And they are doing so.

They are calling up another 135,000 troops. And they are going to take over more and more of the fighting.

The America that brought NATO into being is the same America supporting freedom in Asia today—and for the Asians, not for the Americans.

There is not a square foot of South Vietnam that we want to keep. There is not a bag of rice in South Vietnam that we need. There is not a base, nor a port, nor a landing field in South Vietnam that is going to remain American. Our aim there is identical with that which we had, and will continue to have, in NATO. We want only to assist the people of the area to acquire the ability to ensure their own security.

Of course there are those who say that the prospects are bleak and that the situation is hopeless.

This is not the first time in history that those on the sidelines have been without hope.

There were many who were faint-hearted about Berlin when the Soviets blockaded it. They said that the odds were against the United States position there, that the city was not really defensible, that it would be cut off and strangled, no matter what we did—and they said that it was best to give up gracefully and just get out.

Some of the comment I hear about South Vietnam has the same ring of despair.

Other critics, both here and overseas, ask why it is that we, with all our military might, cannot defeat North Vietnam. But they overlook the point that we are not attempting to conquer North Vietnam. We are not trying to destroy the government in the North. We just want the North Vietnamese to stop their aggression against the South.

This nation is interested in a free Asia, just as we are interested in a free Europe. But this does not mean that we see ourselves as the policemen of the world.

We have no illusions that we have the ability, or the duty, or the right to attempt to settle all the problems of the world by ourselves.

But there are areas of particular American concern, because of the threat they present to the stability of the world upon which depends our own peace, our prosperity and our continued opportunities for progress.

So I have no apologies to make to our European friends or to our American critics for the policy of the United States with respect to Vietnam.

Let us meet another question head-on. Some ask whether we in fact have any policy in Vietnam. They question whether there is anything other than the dismal prospect of more men, more money, more fighting and more death.

At the time I assumed office, the President ordered a comprehensive review of United States policy and programs in Vietnam.

A major part of my time during these past weeks has been occupied with that review. The results were clear and the results were encouraging. They disclosed that Hanoi could

not bend South Vietnam to its will by military force.

We concluded that Americans will not need always to do more and more, but rather that the increased effectiveness of the South Vietnamese Government and its fighting forces will now permit us to level off our effort—and in due time to begin the gradual process of reduction.

The review established to our satisfaction that Southeast Asia is not for us a "bottomless pit."

The review confirmed the judgment, already reached by President Thieu, that the South Vietnamese were ready to take on more of the responsibility and to carry more of the military burden.

As we level off our contribution of men, we are accelerating our delivery to the South Vietnamese armed forces of the most modern weapons and equipment.

We are increasing their supply of M-16 rifles. By July of this year, all combat elements of the regular South Vietnamese ground forces are to be equipped with the M-16. By November, 1968, 100,000 more M-16's will have been provided to the Regional and Popular forces. In addition, the South Vietnamese expanded Airborne Division is receiving M-60 machine guns, M-79 grenade launchers and M-29 mortars. The shipment of about 2,000 trucks and more than 6,000 radios is being expedited.

As the South Vietnamese gain in military strength, and as the enemy continues to sustain losses, we still hope, however, for a peaceful settlement instead of a military solution. A stable peace is the only true victory for Vietnam. As a result of the President's actions and at least a minimal response from Hanoi, there is some reason for hope. America has always held out its hand in peace, hoping our adversaries would grasp it. We continue to hold out our hand today and perhaps the fingertips will soon touch.

But if Hanoi would rather fight than talk, or elects both to talk and fight, the record of the success we have already achieved shows that military victory in South Vietnam is beyond Hanoi's reach.

The attempt of the North to take over the South by force of arms has been prevented. The South Vietnamese have acquired the capacity to begin to insure their own security through their own efforts. We will continue to help the South exploit these successes, even as we strive for peace through other means.

In summary, we are fulfilling our commitment; we have helped save South Vietnam from being overwhelmed by Communist aggression; we have helped provide the people of South Vietnam an opportunity for self-government; and we have helped give all the population of non-Communist Asia reason to hope for the continued security essential to their freedom. And freedom—like aggression—is contagious. The more there is elsewhere, the greater the chances of safeguarding your own.

I suggest that many present critics some day will applaud our stand in Southeast Asia. But we do not seek their applause. We only ask their realism about the problems and prospects in Southeast Asia.

Equal realism is demanded in the assessment of our foremost domestic difficulty—racial problems and civil disorder.

These are not new problems in America. They have continued throughout our nation's history. We are paying the price today for failing to solve them earlier.

One must regret that but one cannot fail to acknowledge it.

But in acknowledging it one need not accept the spectre of a nation robbed of reason and rationality, of riot and rage sweeping every American city, of some sort of uncontrollable civic insanity.

Examples of a breakdown of law and order do not establish that the entire nation has lost its way in a tangled jungle of emotion and extremism.

Part of this problem was solved with the Civil War. Part was solved with a historic decision of the Supreme Court in 1954. Part was solved a decade later when President Johnson proposed and Congress enacted perhaps the most fundamental piece of legislation on civil rights ever passed by an assembly of free men.

In 1965, and just now in 1968, the President achieved the passage of more sweeping laws in this field. Indeed, no President since Lincoln has accomplished as much for a minority group as Lyndon Johnson.

The ferment and difficulties in the country today over these issues are not the sign of failure. They are not a sign that our national fabric is being ripped apart. They are a sign that irrational inequities cannot be suppressed.

Of course violence and destruction in our streets cannot be condoned—and no sane man condones them. But neither should the causes be ignored.

Of course law and order must be maintained. But we must also face the challenge and eliminate the remaining injustices that condemn some citizens to an environment that breeds despair and violence.

America has met similar challenges in the past to the lasting betterment of all our people and the improved ability of our system to meet the continuing demands of a dynamic society.

One such epic challenge was that of the labor movement. Many today overlook the turbulence and trial through which it put our social conscience. The whole long, hard struggle for the rights of the working man the whole rich history of the trade union movement was attended by prophecies of doom.

In that period, also, some believed that an infection of violence was spreading across America. Existing statutes were challenged, strikers and strike-breakers fought in our streets, debates raged over rights and principles and duties. To some it seemed that our country was being torn apart, that its foundations were being shaken, that our political institutions were being paralyzed.

Men were killed then. Families suffered then. The nation was then divided in opinion and emotions, but out of that turmoil and that suffering and that strife, America emerged as an example to the world of how management and labor could live and thrive and progress together. In bridging these social rifts and healing these social wounds, our country became stronger, more resilient and more resourceful than it had ever been before.

We have met and solved, in this generation, within our own constitutional processes, another social problem of equivalent dimensions and complexity. That was the Great Depression of the 1930's, with the plight of hopelessness and fear it spread.

At one period, every bank in the country was ordered closed by the President, lest panic destroy the entire financial system overnight.

One-fourth of our entire working population was unemployed.

Fear, bewilderment and doubt of our ability to stem the economic paralysis were prevalent.

Once again, it appeared that our problems were threatening to tear our nation apart and some predicted that the free economic institutions under which we live would be overthrown or abandoned.

But we met this challenge as no stumbling giant could. The innovations and imaginative use of America's vast human and natural resources left us stronger, more resourceful

and more progressive than we had been in the pre-depression boom years.

Young, affluent Americans who did not live through the depression period cannot imagine what it was like. And there will come a time when young Americans—of all races—will be unable to comprehend what is taking place in our urban ghettos today. For the ghettos, one day, will be gone. The riots, the disorder, the violence that they breed will one day—and I pray one day soon—be over and forgotten.

Our civil rights problem can and must be solved without violent revolution.

In this regard, we are learning more about maintaining law and order in our cities. Specifically, we are learning more about the use of supplementary law enforcement, about the best way that National Guardsmen and Federal troops, if necessary, can help local and state civilian law enforcement authorities meet their problems.

In our society, enforcement of the law is basically a civilian responsibility. But last year, in Detroit, thousands of Federal troops had to be used to assist the police.

We have learned that manpower, not firepower, deals best with mass lawlessness. We have learned, too, that a curfew can help greatly in preventing clashes and conflict and possible bloodshed.

This year, in Washington, D.C., and in several other cities, we applied these lessons.

Thousands of Federal troops were involved. But not a single life was lost due to any action by those Federal troops.

We continue to learn as we continue to go forward.

Ladies and gentlemen, as we seek the answers to the myriad problems that beset us, there is one ultimate question left.

And that is: What is America?

What really is this country that brave men, hope blazing high in their hearts—once called the *New World*?

It is merely a geographical location, defined by latitude and longitude on a chart?

Or is America not more profoundly an idea: an affirmation, defined politically by a principle and a philosophy that have fired men's aspirations around the globe for nearly two centuries.

Perhaps America might be described as a dividing line in the ancient argument about man and his purposes.

This nation was forged in a furnace of faith: a faith that free men would prevail no matter what the struggle.

The nation's fiber was strengthened and tempered by the battle against those who have tried to impose limits on the nation's belief in itself.

This nation has found power in welding its people together in a common dedication—not to a dreary uniformity—but to a daring diversity.

If this nation is characterized by any single and unique quality out of the restless welter of opinion that a devotion to democracy demands, it is the stubborn belief that progress is our destiny—both individually, and as a society—and that no barrier to that destiny can be built that a determined America will not breach.

Ladies and gentlemen, this nation has never had much time for the past, and is forever impatient with the present.

From the very beginning, our chosen time-frame was the future.

Our motivating force has been to fashion a greater prospect, not only for America, but for free men everywhere.

We have faced fearful problems in the past and have solved them. We will meet those of today and surmount them.

As for tomorrow, I can promise only new and even more complex trials in the glorious and ever ascending journey on the path to greater human progress.

For those to whom much is given—much is expected. Thank you.

PAN AMERICAN MAKES SIGNIFICANT CONTRIBUTION TO R. & R. PROGRAM FOR VIETNAM SOLDIERS

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, a commendable article written by Bill Prochnau, of the *Seattle Times*, one of the west coast's finest writers, has recently been called to my attention. The article, "Vietnam Soldier Can Travel From War to World of Luxury," appeared in the *Washington Star* and deals with our rest and recuperation program now in progress in the Pacific. It tells of the tremendous job being done to airlift our fighting men away from the battlefronts when their time comes for a break from combat for the purpose of refreshing and revitalizing the mind and body.

As the article indicates, nothing ever attempted before on an R. & R. basis can compare with opportunities now being afforded our men to "get away from it all" in the days allotted them. As every American fighting man is offered a 5-day vacation somewhere near the halfway mark of his 1-year tour in Vietnam, the obvious desire is to get as far away from the horrors of war, as quickly as possible. This is where Pan Am has stepped in with its jet fleet, staffed with their prettiest and most charming stewardesses, and loaded with first-class delicacies, usually known only to the passengers who book themselves "first cabin." Nothing is too good for the men on R. & R. and so Pan Am furnishes them with steak and ice cream, midflight movies, if possible, and an aura of luxury. They are jetted away to one of several locations of their choice, to any of nine of the most exotic and exciting cities in the Far East or they can opt to travel to Sydney or as close to home as Hawaii. The airline also offers discounted fares to the wives or parents meeting the men in the islands.

Pan Am originally donated its planes to the Government for a token payment of \$1 a month to get things started and had its R. & R. airlift in operation just 3 weeks after the Government decision to start the program. The airlift is now provided through a nonprofit contract with the Government and is described by men who ride it as the closest thing to heaven they can imagine.

Mr. President, as this article indicates, a tremendous job is being done by this company to see that our men on R. & R. lack nothing enroute to their brief respite from the rigors of war. Pan Am even maintains a better on-time rating on its R. & R. flights than most airlines do in their commercial operations, knowing how disappointing a delayed or scrubbed flight would be for these eager G.I.s.

Problems of wartime logistics are not new to Pan American World Airways. The Berlin airlift was accomplished with the use of Pan Am's planes and cooperation. The Korean airlift could not have been accomplished without Pan Am's help. In World War II Pan Am made its entire fleet of aircraft available to the Air Transport Command and NATS and scouted the sites for 56 airbases as well.

It has been demonstrated that in times of international strife, Pan Am, like many major American businesses, can be

counted on to step forth with what is needed to do the job.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article written by Mr. Prochnau, and published in the *Washington Evening Star*, be printed in the *RECORD*.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

VIETNAM SOLDIER CAN TRAVEL FROM WAR TO WORLD OF LUXURY

(By William W. Prochnau)

HONG KONG.—Alexander the Great's warriors took their rest and recuperation where they could find it along the battle trail to Persia.

Caesar's legions lived it up in conquered European villages, spreading Roman culture and progeny throughout most of the civilized world.

The luckiest of the weary American G.I.'s in the Second World War could hop a jeep and bump down to the Riviera for a day or two away from hell.

Rest and recuperation, a soldier's respite from the dirt and death of battle, is as old as war itself.

But none of those earlier soldiers could have imagined R. & R. as it is today. The American soldier in Vietnam is given the best money can buy. His R. & R. not only is no exception but probably is the best example.

NINE R. & R. LOCATIONS

Somewhere near the midpoint of his one-year tour in Vietnam, every American fighting man is offered a five-day vacation. But no longer does that mean frolicking in a conquered village or hitch-hiking a jeep ride away from the lines.

Today's G.I. is given a choice of a holiday in any of nine of the most romantic and exotic cities in the world. He can fly 6,000 miles to Honolulu for an idyllic rendezvous with his wife. He can travel to Sydney where he can forget the war briefly in a sea of Australian miniskirts and the world's warmest hospitality.

Or he can choose Tokyo, Hong Kong, Taipei, Penang, Singapore, Bangkok or Kuala Lumpur—each an Oriental pearl.

Everything about R. & R. is luxurious and designed to put miles—mentally and physically—between the fighting man and his war.

The luxury begins the moment a G.I. steps aboard the airplane. The prettiest and most charming stewardess of the Pan American line will serve him steak and ice cream. He might get an in-flight movie and surely will get all the first-class accoutrements expected by any sophisticated traveler.

The air travel is provided by the government through a no-profit contract with Pan Am. The rest of the R. & R. expenses are paid by the soldiers themselves.

But they find discounts at most of the best hotels in most R. & R. cities. Restaurants, bars, tour guides and even taxicab drivers knock down their prices for vacation G.I.s.

The result is a once-in-a-lifetime experience, a holiday that would be the envy of any well-to-do and well-traveled civilian.

"I don't know who dreamed all this up," an enlisted man said here, "but he oughta get a medal."

FEW PROBLEMS

During the past 12 months 400,000 war-weary servicemen have flown into another world. That great exodus of young Americans could have been fraught with problems—and many officials, both American and foreign, expected trouble. But few problems have materialized since the R. & R. programs began 21 months ago.

The Vietnam-era soldier is one of a new breed—better educated and more sophisticated than his predecessors. Like any soldier coming out of war, he is likely to look for

a girl, a bar and all the high living he can cram into five days.

But today's G.I. is busting up far fewer hotel rooms and bars than his father did in the Second World War. He is doing much less street brawling. And he is far more likely to visit a palace in Thailand, a sheep ranch in Australia or a Shinto temple in Japan.

The R. & R. program has been so successful that American officials now are beginning to add up some unexpected bonuses—most notably the chance to show one of America's best faces, its youth, in a part of the world in which the United States would like to woo and keep friends.

Commanders say their troops work better, think better and fight better after R. & R. The G.I.'s themselves just count the days to eligibility.

For the fighting man who takes his R. & R. in Honolulu, it is like being ejected from hell into paradise—and getting a second honeymoon thrown in.

Waikiki Beach is good-time, wealthy, peaceful America at play. The war in Vietnam simply doesn't exist here.

HONOLULU MOST POPULAR

Every month 7,000 American fighting men go to Honolulu for R. & R. It is the war's biggest and most popular R. & R. center. It is the only American city that a vacationing G.I. can visit. It is balmy, tropical and serene. The way of life is devoted to pleasure—a hedonistic antithesis of the life the soldiers temporarily are leaving behind.

But hedonism is not the main Hawaiian attraction for American G.I.'s. Hawaii is just close enough to the mainland for a rendezvous with the girl he left behind. Almost 80 percent of the G.I.'s who select Honolulu are meeting their wives there.

The emotion-jarring experience of meeting and then leaving your spouse once again causes some war-separated families to decide against Honolulu for a second honeymoon.

Down Under, in Australia, R. & R. has different attractions.

Twenty-five years ago the Yanks charged into Australia for their first taste of its unique brand of hospitality.

Rambunctious and eager, they came away from the bloody beach landings and the bitter jungle fighting of the Pacific war for a few days of rest and recuperation in a land few of them ever had seen before.

They got little rest and they did little recuperating. In fact, those high-living Yanks of the Second World War just about tore old Sydney Town apart. And the Australians, rambunctious themselves, loved every minute of it.

Now the Yanks are coming again from a different, dirty little jungle war in Asia. When the word got out last fall that American fighting men would come here from Vietnam for rest and recuperation, memories of times past prepared Australians for an onslaught.

THE QUIET AMERICANS

The Aussies, hoping for the worst, were a little disappointed.

The new Yanks doffed their uniforms, donned civilian clothes and quietly melted into Sydney's teeming crowds.

"I see about one of 'em a week," said a taxi driver with a dismayed look that reflected a lost experience, not a lost fare.

The Australians have named their guests the "Quiet Americans." But if the new American soldier is more subdued than his dad, he still hasn't lost any of that old camaraderie with the Australians.

Of all the nine cities a Vietnam fighting man can visit on R. & R., Sydney is the one that swamps him with the most hospitality.

Taxi drivers have turned off their meters and taken G.I.'s on all-day tours. Australian families are on waiting lists to invite soldiers

to dinner. And ranchers in Australia's "out-back" have been known to pay a serviceman's air fare to their homes in the interior.

When a G.I. arrives there, he is greeted by a group of Australian matrons at the R. & R. center in a downtown hotel. The women ask each visiting soldier what he wants to do in Australia. Most of the requests, from petting a kangaroo to visiting an Australian home, are filled almost immediately.

While the married men head for Honolulu and some of the servicemen are flying to Australia, R. & R. for most of the Vietnam fighting men means five days in one of seven Oriental cities.

ASIAN ATTRACTIONS

Each Asian center has its own special attractions. Few G.I.'s are disgruntled if they show up in Kuala Lumpur instead of Tokyo or in Taipei instead of Bangkok. Still, as often as possible, the G.I.'s are allowed to select the site.

So a G.I. might head for Tokyo because his big brother extolled Japan's mama-san reputation after the Korean War.

Another might choose Hong Kong because, as the sailors say, it's the biggest PX in the world. They come back carting tape recorders, cameras, tailor-made suits and, usually, hangovers.

Few of them had ever heard of Penang before Vietnam, but now that Malaysian city is a favorite among the Marines.

Bangkok, all the returnees say, has the friendliest and prettiest girls.

Taipei is picking up a word-of-mouth reputation as the most underrated of all the R. & R. cities. The word is out that the smart set heads for the Nationalist China capital.

History buffs like Singapore, but they usually find more than history there.

It is obvious that there are many more chances for trouble in the rest-and-recuperation program in the Asian cities. Almost all the cities are risking political problems and antiwar demonstrations by allowing visits by Vietnam fighting men.

In Hong Kong, for instance, where the British and the Communist Chinese have been involved in an eyeball-to-eyeball confrontation, one of the sorepoints is the R. & R. program.

AVOID DEMONSTRATIONS

But most of the G.I.'s are smart enough to steer a wide course around political demonstrations.

The G.I. who is cut loose for five days in Bangkok or Taipei or any of the Asian centers finds plenty of opportunities for therapeutic hell-raising—maybe too many opportunities to suit a worried Mom back home. But almost anyone in Vietnam who is interested in the welfare of the G.I.'s thinks that R. & R. hell-raising, after all, is the best medicine in the world for a war-weary American fighting man.

There is no one in Vietnam any more concerned about the welfare of his "boys" than the Army's 4th Division chaplain, a rough-edged and crusty Catholic priest from Brooklyn, Father Joseph Francis Sheehan.

Father Sheehan gets a little sore when someone attaches what he calls the "stigma that my boys are all off sinning" when they are on R. & R.

"You can't stop a man from going to hell if he wants to get there," the priest says. "And it doesn't make any difference whether he's in a little town in Georgia, in the city of New York or in Hong Kong."

Father Sheehan says that R. & R. is not just important but also essential for the morale of the troops.

UNIQUE AIRLINE

Here in Hong Kong Pan American operates a unique airline within an airline that whisks the G.I.'s out of the war and into the world.

The most discouraging thing that could happen to an eager G.I. heading for R. & R. would be to have his flight scrubbed or delayed seriously. The R. & R. airline has had an on-time rating of between 90 and 92 percent, far higher than the record of most commercial airlines.

Much of the credit for the almost flawless record of the R. & R. airline belongs to a soft-spoken former Pan Am pilot named Thomas J. Flanagan. Recently named Pan Am's vice president for Far East operations, Flanagan had the R. & R. airline in operation only three weeks after the government decided to start the program.

And the stewardesses have developed a rapport with their passengers that you see on few commercial flights.

"Getting on a plane with 162 soldiers is a bit unnerving the first time," said Peggy Deuringer of South Bend, Ind. "You expect them to tear everything apart. But it's just the opposite. They aren't rowdy. They're the most polite people you'll ever meet."

DR. MUELLER, OF WISCONSIN, APPOINTED EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF CABINET COMMITTEE ON PRICE STABILITY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, President Johnson could not have made a better choice than Willard F. Mueller to be Executive Director for the Cabinet Committee on Price Stability. Dr. Mueller has had a highly distinguished career in economics and is eminently qualified for this important position.

Following his service in the U.S. Navy from 1943 to 1946, Dr. Mueller attended the University of Wisconsin where he received his B.S. and M.S. degrees. He was awarded the Ph. D. degree in economics from Vanderbilt University in 1955.

Dr. Mueller had served on the faculties of the University of California and the University of Wisconsin prior to his appointment in 1961 as chief economist of the Select Committee on Small Business, House of Representatives. Since that time he has been Chief Economist and Director of the Bureau of Economics of the Federal Trade Commission.

Dr. Mueller's book on the "Changing Structure of Food Retailing," as well as his many professional articles in the field of industrial organization, demonstrate his special competence and knowledge of the problems involved in achieving price stability.

In his new position Dr. Mueller will be responsible for planning the research and staff work for the committee, as well as the conferences to be sponsored by the Cabinet Committee.

I ask unanimous consent that the White House release concerning Dr. Mueller be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,

April 13, 1968.

The President announced today his intention to appoint Willard F. Mueller of Wisconsin, currently Chief Economist of the Federal Trade Commission, as Executive Director for the Cabinet Committee on Price Stability. In this newly created position, Dr. Mueller will be responsible for planning the research and staff work for the Committee, as well as the conferences to be sponsored by the Cabinet Committee.

The President established the Cabinet Committee on Price Stability in a memorandum issued February 23, 1968. The members of the Committee are the Secretaries of Treasury, Commerce, and Labor, the Director of the Budget, and the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers. In establishing this Committee the President said:

"This Cabinet Committee reflects our deep concern for a more effective Government effort in dealing with the long-run problems of inflation. This step will fortify our fiscal and monetary policies which are the first line of defense against inflation. As I said in my Economic Report, 'Existing Government organization is not effectively suited to deal with the full range and dimensions of the problem of prices.' We must develop a strong and imaginative program for 1968 and subsequent years through the work of this Committee. This program is intended to strengthen free market institutions."

As Executive Director, Dr. Mueller will work with the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, who has been designated by the President to coordinate the work of the Committee and to supervise the professional staff.

BIOGRAPHICAL DATA ON WILLARD F. MUELLER

Willard F. Mueller was born in Minnesota in 1925. After serving in the United States Navy from 1943 to 1946, he attended the University of Wisconsin where he received his B.S. and M.S. degrees, and Vanderbilt University where he was awarded the Ph.D. degree in economics in 1955.

Dr. Mueller was on the faculty of the University of California from 1954 until 1957 and the University of Wisconsin from 1957 to 1961. In 1961 he served as Chief Economist of the Select Committee on Small Business, House of Representatives, U.S. Congress. Since 1961 he has been Chief Economist and Director of the Bureau of Economics of the Federal Trade Commission.

Dr. Mueller has also been a Professorial Lecturer at American University and a visiting Professor of Economics at Michigan State University. He currently is a part-time staff member in the Department of Economics at the University of Maryland. Dr. Mueller has written a book on the "Changing Structure of Food Retailing" as well as many professional articles in the field of industrial organization and public policy. He has testified frequently before Congressional Committees. He is a member of the American Economic Association.

In 1948 he married the former Shirley Irene Liesch of Laona, Wisconsin. Mr. and Mrs. Mueller have three children: Keith, age 14, Scott, age 12, and Kay, age 10. The Muellers are residents of Madison, Wisconsin, and currently reside at 504 G Street, S.W., Washington, D.C.

NATIONAL FIRE SERVICE RECOGNITION DAY

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, on March 13, the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson] introduced Senate Joint Resolution 152, which would designate the second Saturday of May of each year as National Fire Service Recognition Day.

It is most appropriate that the Nation pay tribute to the unselfishness and devotion to duty that the public has come to expect and receives from the Nation's firemen.

As in other areas, technology has come a long way since the early bucket brigade. Yet, despite these advances, the key to successful firefighting remains the individual fireman. His devotion and

courage, sometimes in the face of impossible odds, make all of us rest a little easier.

Damage from the recent riots which swept the Nation was minimized by the prompt response and long hours spent by the firemen in saving human life and property. These events help to underscore the importance to society of these dedicated men.

Mr. President, I wish to add my support to the joint resolution, and I hope that the Committee on the Judiciary will take early and favorable action on it.

CONNECTICUT DIVISION OF AAUW CHAMPION'S HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, I know that every Senator is aware of the splendid, patriotic work done by the American Association of University Women. Not the least of their services has been the championing of the human rights conventions.

The Connecticut division is an excellent example of the fine work being done by the AAUW in the field of human rights. The members of the Connecticut division have been hard at work interesting others in the cause of human rights. So far, the Connecticut branches of the YWCA, United Church Women, Council of Churches, and UNA-USA have all pledged their support to work for the ratification of the human rights treaties.

The Connecticut division of the AAUW has also sent a letter to President Johnson and Senators RIBICOFF, DODD, and FULBRIGHT, among others, expressing the division's view of the human rights conventions. I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NIGHT LETTER

APRIL 16, 1968.

President LYNDON B. JOHNSON.
Senator ABRAHAM RIBICOFF.
Senator THOMAS DODD.
Senator WILLIAM FULBRIGHT.

At this time when the Congress is faced with many decisions, which involve vast spending, Senators can take a long neglected action with no spending needed.

On behalf of the 2500 members of the Connecticut division of the American Association of University Women, I urge that the three human rights conventions on genocide, political rights of women, and forced labor now in committee be presented to the Senate for ratification.

Sincerely yours,

CLAIRE FULCHER, President.

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, today marks the second anniversary of scheduled jet operations at Washington National Airport. I believe it is an appropriate time to evaluate what has happened during the intervening period and what is now being proposed for the future.

In January 1966, when the Federal Aviation Administration first announced it was reversing a longstanding policy banning scheduled jet operations in and out of National Airport, I voiced

opposition to such a move. This opposition was not a matter of mere personal whim, but rather it was based on facts and reason. First, the FAA had consistently maintained that National Airport was not safe for large jet aircraft. Second, there were, and still are, two underutilized jet airport facilities serving the Nation's Capital—Dulles and Friendship. It was clear that National Airport was already severely overcrowded and that the introduction of jets would further aggravate that condition. Third, it was immediately apparent that jets would create an intolerable noise problem over densely populated areas of the Washington metropolitan region. In response to citizen protests, the FAA established a noise abatement procedure and a noise monitoring system. The noise abatement procedure was immediately criticized by the Airline Pilots Association and has rarely been followed. The monitoring system resulted in a whitewash of the jet noise problem. Citizens were told that jets are really quiet. Despite such assurances, however, school classes continue to be interrupted, a number of hospitals are subject to constant noise, and homeowners are continuing to protest this unwarranted intrusion into their daily lives.

Last week word leaked out that plans are afoot to launch a campaign to make National the airbus depot for Washington. This latest development was too much for Washington's Evening Star which originally welcomed the introduction of jet service to National. In an editorial the other day entitled "Enough is Enough," the Star stated that some major airlines seem unable to abandon the "irrational dream" of further substantial flight increases at National.

I ask unanimous consent to place this pertinent editorial in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH

Washington National Airport was built to handle a load of about 4 million passengers a year; the volume last year exceeded 8 million. This in itself, as Senator Byrd of Virginia suggests, is sufficient reason to justify an intensification of efforts to divert some of National's flights to Dulles. To speak at this point of substantial further flight increases at National is preposterous.

Yet that is the irrational dream that some of the major airlines seem unable to abandon. Their campaign is by no means new. For a long time now, they have nourished the illusion of how lovely it would be if the huge jumbojets of the near future were able to lumber into National, disgorging their hundreds of passengers conveniently on the doorstep of the Capital. According to one report, a recent session produced the idea that National's main runway might be extended into the Potomac River in order to make this hope a reality.

As pointed out the other day by Charles Yarborough, The Star's aviation editor, however, there is fortunately nothing to suggest a wavering on this subject by Federal Aviation Administrator William F. McKee. A report will be forthcoming soon on improvements at National which is expected to deal with facilitating the handling of the present crowds of people. But there must be no eas-

ing of the present ban on larger jets or on hourly limits on jet use.

ALL ALONE WITH THE FEDERAL RESERVE

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, a thought-provoking editorial in the Kansas City Times of April 20 points up the burden which has been placed on the Federal Reserve in attempting to stem the rising inflation in this country.

Without the exercise of long overdue fiscal discipline in the form of budget reductions and increased taxes, however, it is doubtful the Federal Reserve can single-handedly prevent further deterioration in the purchasing power of the dollar. Fiscal and monetary policy must work in concert in effort to stabilize the economy and restore confidence in the dollar.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial in question, "All Alone With the Federal Reserve," be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALL ALONE WITH THE FEDERAL RESERVE

The Federal Reserve system has again flashed the red alert in the nation's battle against inflation. But the only weapon it can use is monetary restraint. The weapon was employed again this week. But unfortunately Congress continues to sit there, deaf to the exhortations of the administration and of most economists: That tight monetary policy, in this situation of spiraling inflation, is inadequate, and that Congress should sign on for the duration of the war against inflation. It could do so by increasing taxes and by imposing a priority structure on the federal budget that would establish what the nation must do and what it would like to do, but for financial reasons, cannot.

Here, we will avoid the technicalities of the issue and speak to principle. Suffice to say, credit has once more been tightened, and for obviously sound reasons. On the day that the independent Federal Reserve made its move, the chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers explained the necessity:

"In the absence of tax action or a big dose of added monetary restraint, an excessive rate of economic growth would be in prospect as far as one could see out to the horizon."

At the horizon, we might add, there is a loud and sudden drop into economic chaos.

The peril is inflation, and a lot of people have been screaming about that for some time. In the absence of any real self-restraint on the part of labor and business, in the absence of any self-restraint on the part of government (which can be brought about only by Congress)—in these circumstances the one available alternative was credit restraint. The Federal Reserve's action was thus not a great surprise, although some had expected it to come a bit later, after Congress had had time to consider the tax and budget matter in more detail.

But the Federal's board of governors seems to be as skeptical of Congress as are many citizens, and felt it could not wait.

Thus the nation finds itself in a situation similar to that of some two years ago when tight monetary policy was employed but Congress refused to go the tax-increase route (and Mr. Johnson refused to lead). The seeds of our present difficulty were then cast to the winds. The dollar has suffered. Every citizen has suffered.

But Congress, sublime in its inactivity, has refused to come to the aid of its country. As unpleasant as credit-restraint medicine is, it is far better than nothing. But is it enough? That's the question Congress must ask. The answer is obvious.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will call the roll.

The following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 119 Leg.]

Bartlett	Holland	Pearson
Bayh	Hruska	Pell
Bennett	Inouye	Prouty
Boggs	Jackson	Proxmire
Burdick	Jordan, N.C.	Ribicoff
Byrd, W. Va.	Long, Mo.	Russell
Carlson	Long, La.	Smith
Clark	McClellan	Sparkman
Cotton	McGee	Talmadge
Curtis	McGovern	Thurmond
Dirksen	Monroney	Tydings
Ellender	Morse	Williams, Del.
Ervin	Moss	Young, N. Dak.
Gruening	Murphy	Young, Ohio
Hickenlooper	Muskie	
Hill	Pastore	

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] is absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOMAY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are necessarily absent.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is detained on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of West Virginia in the chair). A quorum is not present.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Louisiana.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, the following Senators entered the Chamber and answered to their names:

Aiken	Fannin	Miller
Allott	Fong	Mondale
Anderson	Fulbright	Morton
Baker	Griffin	Mundt
Bible	Hansen	Nelson
Brewster	Harris	Percy
Brooke	Hart	Scott
Byrd, Va.	Hartke	Smathers
Cannon	Hatfield	Spong
Case	Hayden	Stennis
Church	Hollings	Symington
Cooper	Jordan, Idaho	Tower
Dodd	Magnuson	Williams, N.J.
Dominick	McIntyre	
Eastland	Metcalfe	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TYDINGS in the chair). A quorum is present.

AMENDMENT OF THE LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which the clerk will state.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. S. 1401, a bill to amend title I of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my senior colleague [Mr. ELLENDER].

So far as I know, no one in this body opposes the purpose of providing large amounts of money for recreational areas and to provide better development of the recreational areas we already have.

The amendment offered by the senior Senator from Louisiana makes it clear that we favor an authorization of such amount as may be necessary to proceed with the full and complete development, as rapidly as funds can be made available, of the recreational facilities of this country.

So the amendment, offered by the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], would make it clear that we would authorize the amount of funds requested by the sponsors of S. 1401 to be appropriated for the purposes that the sponsors of that measure request. Where we take issue with the sponsors of that bill is that we believe it is bad legislative practice to attempt to earmark the revenues to be derived from exploration of the Outer Continental Shelf to a recreation program. In that respect the bill would be very bad law. It would set a bad precedent. It would mortgage the future of the coastal States for programs having no relation to the origin of these funds.

On that basis, Mr. President, we feel that the bill should be amended to provide for authorization. As one Member of this body, I would expect to vote for the appropriation of funds to support the authorization to provide for the purposes set forth in the bill and the purposes indicated in the committee report.

As one who is chairman of the Committee on Finance, if need be I would even be willing to vote for a tax to provide the funds to advance the needs of recreation, as well as other purposes that we find to be desirable, if the funds for them should not be adequate for the purpose. But, Mr. President, there are some things that are seriously wrong about the bill, particularly when it comes to earmarking these revenues for a recreation program.

The legislation purports to dispose of funds which are presently subject to judicial proceedings before the Supreme Court of the United States. In a case to which the United States and Louisiana are parties, the Court is, at this time, attempting to determine the location of Louisiana's coastline. The resolution of the question of just where this coastline begins is essential to the ultimate determination of which party owns what part of the offshore lands. Pending the final decision of the Court on this question, as Senators are aware, the funds

yielded from the disputed area are deposited in an escrow account.

This escrow account has now grown to a billion dollars and increases every day. While, to be sure, not all of the Outer Continental Shelf revenues are held in escrow, a substantial part of these proceeds are so encumbered and will remain so until released by a decision of the Court. Despite this, the bill before us would include these impounded funds to the extent to which the Federal Government is determined to own them.

I submit, Mr. President, that it is not sound policy to legislate the disposition of property rights the ownership of which is still subject to judicial determination.

A second objection which I have to the method used in this bill to derive the needed revenues is that the normal appropriating process is largely bypassed and instead a procedure which, if not exactly "back door financing," is what we might call funding through an unlocked side door. S. 1401 dedicates approximately \$100 million a year for the first 3 years and \$200 million a year for the following 2 years from the Outer Continental Shelf revenues to the land and water conservation fund, which is primarily a fund to provide additional recreation facilities.

This is a total of \$700 million over a 5-year period. This money, once deposited in this fund, would be subject to appropriation by Congress before it could be spent for the purposes set forth in the Land and Water Conservation Act of 1965. The fact remains, however, that subjecting of this money to the control of Congress before leaving the fund is an empty gesture, since the truth of the matter is that Congress will be compelled to either appropriate the full amount in the fund or see the money accumulate and remain unused. I cannot believe that Congress wishes to hamstring itself in this way. I cannot believe that we want to tie the hands of our Appropriation Committees by passing to them a locked strongbox that only one key will open. I doubt that, at a time when the Nation is at war and faces the greatest budgetary deficit in its history, with urgent and justifiable demands for more and more funds to cure the plethora of domestic ills we face, we should proceed to deny Congress flexible access to this \$700 million for use as prudently set priorities demand.

For example, if our boys, who are fighting a war in Vietnam, needed to be provided with weapons to fight that war, I doubt if Congress would want a law on the statute books which provided that we could not use revenues derived from the Outer Continental Shelf to provide for that war or to provide weapons for the men to defend themselves because we had locked that fund up for other purposes.

Or if someone wanted to be paid for performing a contract for the Federal Government, I doubt that we would want to say, "We cannot pay the bill we owe you, because, while we have the money on hand, we have the money locked up to provide for more land for parks and recreational purposes." I doubt that Congress would want to do that.

When someone presented his Government bond and asked to be paid the principal and interest owed by the Federal Government, I doubt that the Federal Government would like to establish a procedure which said, "I am sorry; we cannot pay the interest on the Federal debt because we have locked the money up in a fund far beyond its immediate needs to be used exclusively for recreational purposes."

In other words, recreation, like the poverty program, the urban development program, the flood control program, the navigation program, the program for development of our resources, a great number of fine programs which I could list here, should be considered on its merits, the priorities should be judged, and the extent to which Federal resources could be devoted to its purposes, as well as others, should then be determined.

I notice that the sponsors of the measure, in the committee hearings, and to some extent in the committee report, made a great deal of the fact that Congress has not appropriated enough money for recreational purposes, as indicated by the Land and Water Conservation Act. That is not the fault of the junior Senator from Louisiana. If more money had been asked for, the junior Senator from Louisiana would have been willing to vote for it, and I think a number of the rest of us would have been willing to vote for it. But if Congress, in its judgment, did not think enough of the program to vote the amount of money the sponsors of the bill believe we should have voted, if Congress did not place that high a priority on the program, at a time when we have a deficit of more than \$20 billion, at a time when we are having to cut back on programs for health and welfare, at a time when we are being asked right now to vote a big tax increase for the people of the country, can it be said that we have such a surplus of funds that we can dedicate the resources of the Outer Continental Shelf to recreation? Can we justify doing this when we cannot find funds to provide for greatly needed and essential activities in this country? I doubt that Congress would want to hamstring itself in that fashion.

May I say further that to buy the argument of the sponsors of this bill that we must dedicate a huge portion of the revenues from the Outer Continental Shelf to recreational purposes, and to the purchase of more land in pursuit of such purposes, because Congress has been too niggardly in appropriating funds for that purpose in the past, is, in effect, for Congress to vote a condemnation of itself.

"We did not vote enough money for this purpose," Congress would in effect be saying, "and, that being the case, we want to dedicate the whole of the resources to be produced in the Outer Continental Shelf to be used for no other purpose but this very worthy purpose of recreation."

Some time ago, some Senators wanted to dedicate the resources of the Outer Continental Shelf to education, and they mustered a very substantial vote in support of that view. That happened when we were debating the tidelands bill, or

the Outer Continental Shelf bill. It was felt by Congress that the resources of the area should go into the general fund of the Treasury of the United States, and, as part of the general revenues, Congress could then decide the best use to make of the income from the resources of these lands which constitute the Outer Continental Shelf.

I must confess, Mr. President, that I have received the impression from time to time that some people view the revenue from oil produced beyond a State boundary as just a pot of gold that somebody has found out there at the end of the rainbow, for which no one paid anything. They would like us to regard it as sort of like gold coins dropping from heaven that nobody knew what to do with, and that therefore it would be desirable to dedicate them to this or that use.

Mr. President, why should not these revenues, presently accruing to the Government of the United States, be spent the same as other revenues accruing to the Government of the United States? Why should they not be used in whatever manner Congress may please, to meet all national needs, all national priorities, in whatever amount Congress may find to be useful for this purpose?

An argument that can be made to the contrary is that there is sometimes a connection between a particular purpose and the funds that come to be dedicated for that purpose. We have seen such special connections. It was contended, when we undertook to build a national Interstate Highway System, that we should increase the gasoline tax. That tax is, in effect, a user tax on those who use the highways; and so it was argued, with good logic, that that money should be dedicated to building highways. People who paid that gasoline tax would know that they were then paying for more highways and for better highways.

That kind of dedication can be well understood. It is more understandable to a taxpayer when he is called upon to pay a high tax on gasoline, since he knows that he is paying the tax for the highway he is driving on; and it is found to be more acceptable, in some instances, on that basis.

The committee seeks to find a connection between the Outer Continental Shelf and the national parks and recreational activities in its report. It says, on page 2 of the report:

The committee's recommendation regarding the use of a portion of the receipts from Outer Continental Shelf lands as an additional source of revenue to finance the outdoor recreation programs authorized by the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act is based on the fully tenable proposition that the revenues from one natural resource which belongs to all the people—

Now, get this, Mr. President—

that the revenues from one natural resource which belongs to all the people of the United States—in this instance a depleting resource—should be reinvested in outdoor recreation areas and developments which become a part of the permanent estate of the Nation for the use, benefit, and enjoyment of all its citizens of this and future generations.

Mr. President, on that committee serve a number of very able Senators who come from States where the Federal Government owns large amounts of land. The revenues from those lands, from the timber resources and the oil and gas beneath those lands, can equally be regarded as a natural resource belonging to all the people of the United States. But in years past, Congress has found a higher use for the revenues derived from the minerals under those federally owned public lands than to put them to recreational uses. The higher use, in the main, has been to take the depleting resources that have been developed from those lands, and use the revenues thus derived to build power facilities, to capture the waters of the streams that flow through or within the areas, to build irrigation structures, and to make arable arid lands which would otherwise be nonproductive, so that when the resource is depleted, there will be something there to take its place. People can then live on the land, farm it, and make income from it. They can make it productive.

A Federal program of that sort is directed toward those States where large amounts of Federal land are located. This is a better use, because it takes the depleting resource and uses the income from it to develop the same geographical area that is being depleted.

I suppose it never occurred to the sponsors of this legislation that the Outer Continental Shelf itself is a vast resource of the Federal Government. It can be claimed to belong to all people of the United States, should not be damaged or destroyed. It should be used constructively for development of its resources, so that when those resources are gone, we may have not just a polluted site or an eyesore for the country, but instead a great national asset that may continue to produce, and from which people can make their livelihood when they can no longer work it to produce oil, gas, phosphates, sulfur, and other minerals from the sea.

Some day, those resources will be gone. Some day, I have no doubt, we will succeed in convincing the majority of both the House of Representatives and the Senate that the enormous resources of the ocean, those on the Continental Shelf of the United States in particular, should be developed, and that the precedents set by the reclamation laws, that took the revenues of that development and reinvested them in providing resources that would last for many years, if not hundreds of years and indefinitely into the future, if they were developed and properly used, should be followed in seeking to find higher purposes for these revenues than to dedicate them to recreation.

That is something, however, that would have to depend on the judgment of Congress. And, if such a decision should be reached, at least it should follow the sound conservation principle that we would first use revenues from those resources to repair the damage done to it by exploiting it and, second, would use the revenues to develop something that could be put there when the resources

that are being depleted have been taken away and are gone. In that way we will have something that people can use indefinitely into the future to provide income and opportunity for the people. In other words, the resources of the sea do not constitute merely a pot of gold that somebody locked onto. They are a God-given asset. They were intended to be used by mankind.

Mr. President, the bill as written is a wrong step in the right direction. To accomplish an altogether salutary end, it would, in an unnecessary way, make meaningless our normal appropriating process and would absolve Congress of its responsibility to plan and carry out an active and direct role in the fiscal processes of the Federal Government.

I will not dwell further on this point, since my senior colleague from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], a member of the Appropriations Committee, has already addressed himself to this point. I do want to emphasize strongly, however, that the method proposed here to finance this fund is imprudent, unwise, and wholly unnecessary. There is no valid reason for linking the Outer Continental Shelf revenues to the needs of the land and water conservation fund, and should the sponsors agree to an amendment severing this ill-conceived connection and proceed through normal channels to fund this worthy program, I would be happy to support their good cause.

There are other and perhaps more compelling reasons for refusing to link up offshore mineral revenues with the land and water conservation fund. There can be no valid argument for tying the two together.

As I understand the argument advanced in the committee report accompanying S. 1401, there is clearly no justification in terms of sound fiscal planning for bypassing the normal Appropriations Committee procedures of this body. As a result, the argument of the sponsors of the bill rests entirely upon the creation of a fictional connection between the Outer Continental Shelf and the need of our citizens for recreational facilities. The proponents attempt to justify the tapping of Outer Continental Shelf receipts and the dedicating of them by maintaining that this connection represents sound conservationist policy.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I am sorry that I was not present to listen to the remarks of the able Senator from the very beginning. However, I gather that the pending bill proposes to use funds derived from the Outer Continental Shelf in the interior of our country.

Does the able Senator not feel that it would be a bit more logical to use these funds to enhance the ocean resources? For example, I can see many uses that will be derived from oceanography. One would be to clear up the pollution in our waters, not just the rivers, but also the oceans.

I was quite interested in and impressed by the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana yesterday about the

pollution of Waikiki Beach by oil. The elimination of this pollution would be one use for which the moneys could be expended.

I am personally very much impressed by the potentials of oceanography. It has been reported that, with the employment of the proper techniques in this field, the fish catch would be improved 100-fold. It has been said furthermore that there are enough food and minerals in the ocean bed to supply mankind for time immemorial.

Would the Senator oppose any move to earmark these moneys for the development of ocean resources?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, it would seem to me that the first order of priority, if we are talking in terms of earmarking the funds derived from the depleted resources, would be to put something in the place of what we are taking away. If we are talking about the resources of the sea and the resources from beneath the sea, we certainly would not want to leave the sea as one big cesspool with more dead fish floating on the sea than were swimming in it. We would not want to leave it so putrid that people dare not go swimming in it or enjoy it. We would want it to be useful.

The first principle of conservation is that from the beginning we should repair the damage done from the time we start to exploit those resources.

Let us take one simple example. The sea is suffering horrible pollution. The pollution covers a large area. The currents move the pollution around. One area suffers from pollution for a while and then later it is not quite as bad. However, some areas stay polluted constantly at the present time.

I have but to refer the Senator to the Potomac River flowing past the Nation's Capital. If the child of the Senator fell in that river, the Senator would be well advised to take the child to the doctor immediately and have the child examined. The doctor would be well advised to put the child in the hospital for a week or two for fear that he had acquired typhoid or hepatitis.

The Potomac River was once a valuable asset. When President Johnson signed the bill—for which there was very meager funding—to do something about pollution, he referred to the fact that Theodore Roosevelt proudly walked out from the White House and swam in the Potomac River where the Washington Monument now is, which would be within easy walking distance from the White House.

Sometimes an oil well comes in with a fantastic pressure from below the sea that blows all pipe, tubing, and casing into the air, and it costs millions of dollars to get down and counterbuild it so as to shut off the flow of oil into the sea. While that is being done, oil is coming out under thousands of pounds of pressure per square inch. The entire area is filled with pollution. It is brought under control eventually.

When people find oil under the sea or land, they put that oil in tankers, some of which hold as much as 100,000 gallons of oil. Sometimes those tankers are de-

stroyed during war. At other times, the ravages of the sea breaks a tanker in two. Airplane pilots have reported oil slicks as large as 100 miles wide and 3 or 4 miles long.

Recently, an oil slick drifted onto the coast of England. They had a bad season as a result of that. They could not swim or enjoy that recreational area because the water was filled with oil which had floated in from the ocean.

If one wants to exploit the resources of the sea, he should first repair the damage that is being done by producing the oil around and moving the oil. It is true that some of the oil is not produced from the sea, but the pollution of the sea is becoming greater and greater.

I would say that if a big oil slick that was miles wide washed up on Waikiki Beach and stayed there for a few months, the economy would suffer greatly because people who wanted to go there and enjoy the recreational facilities of Waikiki Beach and the other gorgeous beaches of Hawaii would not be able to enjoy them. The beaches would be ruined.

Mr. INOUE. We would have to apply for disaster funds.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That is about the size of it.

Furthermore, Mr. President (Mr. Spong in the chair), as the Senator has well pointed out, the estimates are that the potential yield of the sea, in terms of fish, shrimp, lobsters, oysters, and other food, is approximately 40 to 100 times the present yield. People who have made some study of the situation point out that one could farm the sea the way one farms the land and increase the yield fantastically.

A comparison was made by a witness who appeared before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs when I was a member of that fine committee. He said that a good comparison would be the amount of nuts one would get by going into the forest and just looking for nuts and the amount one could get by planting the best kind of pecan trees, properly spaced, fertilizing them, spraying them for protection against insects, and harvesting the crop at the end of the season.

In one instance, he could probably bring home only the amount that would fit in his pockets. By contrast, if the other method were used, he could have enough nutmeat to provide a good living for any number of families, depending upon how much forest had been put to a constructive use. The ground would literally be covered with pecans. The Senator is aware of what the situation would be in a good pecan orchard.

Another illustration is one of people catching hogs. If a person just went out into the forest and tried to kill the wild hogs, he would find that he would not make much of a living by producing ham or any other kind of meat from a hog. On the other hand, if the person carefully raised the hogs, separated them from the predators, and fed the hogs properly, he could have a very good yield.

The same comparison would be true with respect to the yield one could get from corn or wheat if he just went out, willy-nilly, across the countryside and looked among the weed to see if he could

find some grain, compared with what he would have if he plowed the land.

In Louisiana, we had vast areas that were regarded as relatively useless marshland. The Louisiana Land and Exploration Co. recently undertook to see if it could produce shrimp in that land, and they found that they could produce 200 pounds of shrimp per acre by simply controlling the mixture of sea water with fresh water, the fresh water being the rain that fell, and the land being subjected to inundation by the sea. By controlling the salinity of the water, they could produce 200 pounds of shrimp per acre.

I am told that in India, and perhaps in some other areas where they have been working at this matter longer, they are producing 1,000 pounds of shrimp per acre.

If one compared that with the yield of the sea, it would be approximately many times its potential, when we consider what happens to the schools of tiny larvae of shrimp in the sea. The larger shrimp eat millions of them a day. If one simply cut off the predators, killed the bonitas and the other fish that are feeding on the larvae, so that the growth of these resources could be developed, the yield easily could be doubled. In fact, with a reasonable and substantial investment, the yield could be increased tenfold without much difficulty.

Over a period of time, as the proper techniques of aquaculture, which is a term used for farming the sea—it rhymes with "agriculture," but its meaning is a little different—are developed, the yield of the sea with respect to fish could be multiplied enormously. It would mean spawning the kind of fish that multiply best in some areas and spawning the kind of marine life that spawn and multiply most rapidly in other areas. Louisiana is a good area in which to spawn shrimp, and areas along the eastern seaboard, in the Carolinas, are some of the best places to spawn certain other marine life.

I am not an expert on this subject, but I have heard some experts speak on it; and I am convinced beyond any doubt that the time will come when, with proper investment and proper incentives, the income of the State of Hawaii, for example, from the marine resources will be worth literally hundreds of millions of dollars a year, and it might even approach the billion-dollar figure, considering the ocean area which can be planted, spawned, and harvested.

People who know something about the resources of the sea and the potential of the sea stress the fact that to develop those resources, it is not simply a matter of going out there and harvesting what is found. Planting comes first, just as in agriculture. One must plant the seed he hopes to harvest. Then it is nurtured and protected from the predators and from the elements of nature that could harm it. Then, as the yield is developed, it is harvested at the proper time.

I regret to say that, despite all the talk we have done about our research—\$15 billion a year—this Nation is far be-

hind Japan, for example, in developing its sea resources. Perhaps in some respects this is due to the fact that Japan had greater need. But this Nation has neglected its water resources more than any other resource.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. INOUE. I have been told that our scientists in the United States know more about the surface of the moon than about the ocean bed. If this is so, it is a shameful situation, because the potential on the ocean floor, for example, for mining purposes is literally unlimited.

The funds that are concerned in this bill come from the ocean floor—primarily from oil wells. Why cannot these funds be used now for the mining of, say, magnesium or phosphate or bauxite, which scientists tell us should be in immense quantities on the floor of the ocean? These are the minerals and the natural resources we need to keep our Nation progressing.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. There is no reason at all why it cannot be done. All that is needed is the money to develop the method and to find the ways to do it.

Of course, at present we are just beginning to develop our oil resources in the sea. We got there by developing the upland until it reached the sea, and gradually we proceeded into the sea with it; because one could move a little farther out to sea, build a platform, and produce oil. As we went progressively out, we saw an indication of the potential.

Thus far, we have not even been able to get sufficient funds for development of the sea resources in order to find what is there, as the Senator has well pointed out. It may be, as the Senator has suggested, that we actually have made a greater investment in trying to learn what is on the moon than what is beneath the land that is owned by the people of the United States, beneath the sea itself.

These enormous resources, this fantastic potential, according to conservation principles, should be dedicated, first, to repairing the damage done in developing the area; and second, the revenues should be used to develop the potential of the sea, by replacing the resources that are taken from the sea.

There is a very fine program—and I am happy to support it—in which money is plowed back into developing resources in large Federal land holdings in the reclamation States where, for instance, oil and gas are produced. The money is plowed back into the development of resources there, so that in the future when the oil is gone, the gas is gone, and the copper is gone, there would be something there with which people could support themselves and, hopefully, their income would be greater and more abundant than the income they receive from producing oil and gas.

Mr. INOUE. Is it not true that the funds raised in those enterprises just mentioned are primarily plowed back into the States?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. They are. As a matter of fact, one might say they are almost 100 percent plowed back; 52.5

percent goes to the reclamation fund; 37.5 percent goes to those States where the minerals are produced to help them provide essential services to the people producing the revenue in those areas—to provide the necessary education for their children for roads, and such; the other 10 percent, if I recall correctly, generally goes toward administration.

I am not an expert on that program; I would be if I represented one of the States having large Federal land holdings. However, it has been a principle advocated and spoken for eloquently in the Senate since the turn of the century that these mineral resources, as they are extracted, should be devoted, at least in part, and as a practical matter almost entirely, to the development and advancement of those States whose lands yield these revenues.

It is true that everyone can claim he has an interest in the offshore resources of the United States, but the proper way to exercise this claim, would be to, first, repair the damage done in the development of that resource; and, second, to put something there to replace what is being taken away. Then, if one wanted to think in terms of what might be done, he could think in terms of the equities of those who helped to develop the resources.

However, when we speak about water resources generally, I do not think that anyone in this Chamber can say that any other resource in the country has been more sadly neglected, to the very point of criminality, than the water resources of the United States.

Mr. President, look at the Great Lakes, and particularly at Lake Erie. Lake Erie is a good example. People who live in that area call it the world's biggest cesspool. It is so badly polluted it does not produce fish. Its recreational advantages are, for the most part, destroyed. If one were to see that body of water he would not want to swim in it.

Certain areas of the Chesapeake Bay are in about the same shape. The Delaware Bay was once one of our great natural assets. Look at Lake Pontchartrain which is near the city of New Orleans. That lake was once one of the most beautiful recreation areas in the world. We had to close it to swimming because some people were pumping sewage into that body of water. We had to undertake a major program to help clean up that lake.

If someone wants to lay a proper claim to the resources beneath the water, it would be fair for one to proceed in this order: first, repair the mischief and the damage that man is doing to that water now, and then proceed to develop those water resources so that when the minerals beneath them are gone the people can still make a good living.

In the beautiful State of Hawaii, which I have had occasion to visit from time to time, development of recreational assets is a tremendous thing. However, the time will come when the potential of the ocean areas surrounding that great State will be an even greater asset than now. Of course, the old Hawaiians looked upon the sea as an important asset to them, apart from the actual production

of oil from the bottom of the sea. But there is such a tremendous potential there, it would seem that if there is to be a dedication of the water resources of Hawaii, first there should be a dedication to the needs of the sea itself and the people bordering it, and to replace the damage that has been done there, and then, to dedicate those resources to other national needs.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I am deeply impressed by the able Senator's logical argument. I wish to advise my friend that I am on his side in this matter. I thank the Senator for giving me this opportunity to enter into the colloquy.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I very much appreciate the assurances of the Senator from Hawaii. The Senator has taken a great interest in the development of the resources of his great area, as well as the resources of the rest of the country.

When we discuss the resources of the sea, it would be well to consider the fact that we receive large amounts of money from it. I am not endorsing a proposal to earmark those moneys for Louisiana. I do think we have have equities which should be considered one day.

However, I am frank to say that when people go into the sea and produce \$1 billion for the United States, and that figure will increase as the years go by, it would be fair to ask, as one part of the development program, that there be provided some minimal protection for those people from the ravages of the sea.

I have heard about the tidal waves that on occasion have struck the beautiful island of Hawaii. I can only imagine what the damage and devastation has been. I do not have to imagine the damage and devastation which Louisiana has suffered. I have seen what hurricanes can do. People were forewarned when Hurricane Audrey hit Cameron Parish in Louisiana. In Louisiana we call the counties parishes because of the French and Catholic ancestry of the people there. When Hurricane Audrey hit that area, the loss of life was almost 400 people.

Mr. President, that may not sound like a tremendous loss of lives until one realizes that there are only about 2,000 people who live in that particular parish. Therefore, about one-fifth of the people there were killed by that hurricane. One reason that the hurricane killed so many was that it tended to build up the water before it; there was a substantial rise in the water in front of the hurricane as it moved forward. It was not exactly a tidal wave but it had something of that effect, for several feet.

Those people who lost their lives in that hurricane should have some protection, if they are the ones who helped to make this money. That resource is not just a pot of gold that has been found at the end of the rainbow. Someone has to go out and risk his life to develop it. Someone has to build the platforms on the Continental Shelf; someone has to drill for the resources; someone has to haul them to shore; and someone has to

lay the pipelines on the bottom, if the oil is not brought in by barge or ship.

It would be fair to expect people who work in that area and in all coastal areas in the production of those resources and the development of the sea to have some reasonable protection of life and property. There has been some small amount of help. It has been niggardly, but we have been extremely grateful for it.

After Hurricane Betsy, in Louisiana alone, the property damage amounted to \$1 billion. We were grateful to the Federal Government for the loans and grants which it advanced to help our people overcome the ravages of the sea. But go along the beautiful coast of this country, I do not care whether it is Maryland, Virginia, Delaware, South Carolina, North Carolina, Maine, Louisiana, Florida, Mississippi, Alabama, or Texas, where dwellings and other structures are found along the seashore, most are very cheap and flimsy. They are built on the theory that if the sea should "take them," or a hurricane hit there and wipe them out completely, the owners would not have lost too much.

Yet the people who live in those flimsy structures are the very people who are expected to produce billions of dollars in revenue for a recreation program under this bill.

Recreation is a fine purpose but if we are thinking in terms of what we can do, it would be well that the resources of the Outer Continental Shelf and the sea itself should be developed so that when the minerals are gone, the people there will not have to leave, will not have to become migrants, will not have to go somewhere else and look for jobs. We should not be bleeding away the resources; we should be developing the potential of the sea.

There will not only be recreational advantages, and not necessarily federally owned facilities—there is nothing wrong with private ownership of a hotel on the beach or private ownership of a recreational area—but there would also be the potential to produce tremendous amounts of fish, shrimp, lobsters, and all sorts of other edible marine life which would be a great asset to be developed in the years to come.

If one wishes to earmark revenues of the sea for something, here is something that could be supported because of its direct relationship between the source of revenues and the purpose to which those revenues are put.

I would emphasize that there is a good purpose in developing a parks program but that the proposed method would do more harm than good unless the amendment of my colleague [Mr. ELLENDER] is agreed to.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] talks only about conservation as it relates to our national parks. But the bill turns its back entirely on all of the serious conservation problems that exist outside of our national parks.

Are not conservation measures needed to deal with such problems as water pollution, flood control, hurricane protection, fisheries development, mineral resource development? Indeed, are not conservation measures needed to pre-

serve both our coastal waters as well as our great lakes and rivers for recreational and economic use?

Once again, I want to make it clear that I am fully in agreement with the need to develop our park program. But I do disagree with the proposed method which, in longrun terms, will undoubtedly have the effect of creating warring camps among the conservationists themselves.

Should the marine conservationists and the park conservationists be locked in battle against each other as a matter of congressional policy? Should they be compelled to engage in regional disputes as to which areas of the country ought to be conserved at the price of other areas? I say that the problem of how the money for conservation is to be raised is not a problem that the conservationists themselves should be forced to grapple with. The problem of raising revenues is our problem. It is the undeniable responsibility of Congress.

The enactment of S. 1401 in its present form would establish the dangerous precedent of dividing the conservationists into two camps and causing them to have to make decisions which would involve the sacrificing of worthy causes in some areas of the country in order to support other worthy causes in other areas. There is clearly no need for such a precedent. The land and water conservation fund is so worthy a cause that it ought to stand on its own two feet. It ought to receive the appropriations that the committee has asked for without our having to engage in a form of fiscal juggling which can only serve to create confusion and controversy in all of our future planning with respect to conservation.

Is there any Member of this body who will agree that the need to conserve our parks is greater than the need to conserve our water resources? If there is a need to conserve our parks, we should assume our responsibility and meet that need. If there is a like need to conserve our water resources, then that need ought to be met, too. Unless we are fully convinced that one need is, by far, greater than the other, we ought not adopt the policy for the years ahead which compels us to favor one program over the other.

I repeat, Mr. President, this approach to the financing of even such a worthwhile program disturbs me. I am deeply concerned that should we tap the Outer Continental Shelf for the funding of this program, even to the limited extent suggested by the administration, we will have set a precedent which could result in a raid on these revenues for a variety of projects without proper regard for national priorities or prudent conservation practices. The fund could become an easy mark for a variety of pet schemes which could not stand the test of the normal appropriations process.

We must remember that minerals are, by definition, a depleting asset and that reason and foresight force us to utilize these limited resources in ways which will leave our society with tangible permanent assets.

Such a carefully planned and coordi-

nated program will take time. While this coordinated effort is taking place, the precedent which S. 1401 establishes could start a hodgepodge disorganized diversion of the Outer Continental Shelf funds into any number of unrelated programs.

I propose, then, that the Senate give careful consideration to amending the bill so as to leave the Outer Continental Shelf funds completely unencumbered so that an overall comprehensive program founded on sound conservation principles can be developed.

Such an amendment would authorize for the land and water conservation fund the same amount of money requested by the Secretary of the Interior. It would, however, go the more direct route through normal appropriation channels for the funds rather than have them transferred directly from the Outer Continental Shelf receipts.

This would achieve the principal purposes set forth in the bill of adequately funding the program but would avoid the danger of making more difficult a broad and permanent program for the use of all of the Outer Continental Shelf receipts.

Our storehouse of mineral assets is a depleting or a wasting asset. We consume our gas and oil reserves at an alarming rate and we know that there is a limit to how long the supply will last. This sobering fact compels us to think seriously and rationally about how we should best utilize this depleting resource.

We are about to enter a period of gigantic growth in offshore petroleum production. After a while I shall demonstrate how relatively unimportant the offshore petroleum industry will be, in time, when compared with all the other potential resources of the sea; but, at present, I just refer to what we are doing in developing offshore resources in petroleum alone.

On February 5 of this year, Secretary of the Interior Udall told the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

During the past 5 years, receipts from the Outer Continental Shelf lands have averaged \$265 million annually. They are forecast for the next 5 years to average about \$500 million a year.

A few weeks ago we read of the largest Outer Continental Shelf mineral lease sale in history, \$603 million off the shores of the State of California.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me for a moment, without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Washington, under those conditions.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] may be added as a cosponsor of S. 1401.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JACKSON. I thank the Senator from Louisiana for yielding to me.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I cite these growth figures to illustrate the compelling need for a long range, comprehensive program for channeling these resources, which we know to

have a limited life, into programs for developing assets permanent in nature governed by sound conservation principles. It was just this type of prudent thinking which prompted Congress to include as an essential part of the Mineral Leasing Act of 1900 a provision for requiring that 52½ percent of the mineral receipts from public lands be earmarked for the reclamation fund and thus returned to those States where the revenues were derived for use in a sound conservationist program.

This income from mineral leasing has been the prime source of revenue for the reclamation fund since 1920. Up to June 30, 1967, the total paid into the fund from such oil and potassium leasing receipts has been \$818,047,572. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, such receipts amounted to \$56,493,935. The beneficiaries of the reclamation fund have been the 17 Western States, to whose growth and prosperity the programs benefited have greatly contributed.

I firmly believe that history, precedent, and basic considerations of fairplay require that this formula be extended to the federally owned submerged lands. Indeed, the factors which prompted Congress to allocate receipts derived from the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 are just as valid and compelling today, as they were nearly 60 years ago.

We must bear in mind that today, as in 1920, we are dealing with proceeds derived from a wasting asset. Each barrel of oil produced from the submerged lands, each Mc.f. of gas produced from America's Continental Shelf, is a depletion of a capital asset. We must consider these proceeds in that context, and legislation involving their disposition must be permanent in nature. Our solution must be founded upon sound principles of conservation and the prudent utilization of natural resources with a limited life.

I would plan to work in this body with a number of my colleagues in this body to devise a permanent program for the disposition of revenues produced from the public submerged lands, just as Congress has already developed and enacted a permanent program for the disposition of revenues yielded from the lands of the interior of our Nation.

Our long experience with the reclamation fund has proved the logic, and the necessity, of the formula devised by the Congress for the disposition of revenues from the public lands of the interior. Its extension to the public lands underlying the sea would be a prudent investment, more in light of this experience.

Certainly, our national interest demands the maximum development of these areas. The very nature of the mineral development which we have experienced from our seabeds dictates the utilization of the proceeds of such development for purposes of the broadest possible public interest. These resources are depletable. Minerals, by their nature, are capital assets; their commercial development into consumable items amounts to a consumption of a non-recurring asset. Thus, it would be totally imprudent for any responsible government to utilize the economic benefits of

such development for anything but the acquisition of additional capital items.

This conservation principle is embodied in the Mineral Leasing Act.

I feel very strongly in the logic and wisdom of extending that principle to the submerged lands. A substantial proportion of offshore mineral revenues should be dedicated to permanent, long-range programs to foster further development and protection of the resources of the sea.

A major portion of the revenues derived from offshore mineral development should be applied to such high-priority items as control of water pollution which I am informed, would cost about \$50 billion to bring under control; imagine, Mr. President, \$50 billion to just correct the damage the people of this country have already done to their water resources.

Such a program should include increased research in the field of oceanography, hurricane protection, research into the causes, and possible sources and mitigation of earthquakes, for fisheries research, and similar purposes.

The distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] recently introduced a bill to earmark portions of the Federal revenue from Outer Continental Shelf leases for a sea grant college program and for the exploration and mapping of marine environment. We are badly in need of these sea grant colleges, if we are to properly develop these facilities.

There are so many things that these colleges could do. As I see it, just one project of such a college would more than justify their existence. This project is that of utilizing the sea as a source of food for this Nation and the entire world. Mr. President, let us be realistic—feeding the Nation and the world is a problem which will get progressively worse before it gets better.

Now as in the past, this country, as well as the other nations of the world, has looked to the sea as a direct and also indirect source of food. The United States is consuming about 12 billion pounds of fish each year. This amount includes fish used for human food and also for poultry and other stock. We believe that by the year 2000, a scant 32 years from now, this country is very likely to need close to 30 billion pounds of fish for the consumption and use of its citizens. This means that our fishing industry has an opportunity that it never had before. It means that Congress and the Government have an obligation that we have perhaps never sufficiently realized before—to provide the ways and means of increasing the use of the resources adjacent to our own coasts better than two times; that is, from our present 12 billion pounds to more than 24 billion pounds.

If we look at the world consumption of fishery products and the world need for food, we see an even more astounding picture. The world production of all living marine products at the present time is somewhere in the vicinity of 60 million metric tons. It is very likely that in 32 years the world's need will be well over 100 million metric tons, or well over

twice the present production of fish and food.

Let us look at this need from another standpoint. Very recently one of the top officials in Washington estimated that over one-half of the children born into the world each year die before reaching 5 years of age; these deaths, to a considerable degree, are attributed to malnutrition. The greatest cause of death due to malnutrition today is from the lack of adequate protein in the diet. Within the next 32 years, without question, the world is going to need additional food in tremendous quantities. Pinpointing this to fish itself, we are going to need somewhere between two and four times the amount of production from the sea that we are gaining at the present time.

This is an urgent need. It is not something we can wait for; it is not something that is simply a whim or notion of a segment of our economy. It is a tremendous need for our Nation and for the world. The benefits to be derived from the full use of the resources of the sea, and especially those resources around the United States, can have a major favorable impact upon the economy of our country and a major impact upon resolution of perhaps the most important problem facing the world tomorrow—that of feeding its hungry billions.

The seas and ocean bottoms adjacent to the coast of the continental United States and its island possessions are among the richest in the world and, to a considerable degree, less than fully harvested.

As I said before, we are now using about 12 billion pounds of fish every year. Of this, the United States catch is only 5 billion, which means that 7 billion pounds of fish a year are imported into the United States at the present time. Our scientists, in exploring the Continental Shelf and the seas above the Continental Shelf around our coastline, have estimated that we very likely could harvest in a conservative manner—that is, on a sustained yield basis—well over 25 billion pounds of fish without really leaving our own shores or without attempting to fish on the high seas.

Although there is not complete agreement, marine biologists estimate that the seas of the world could annually sustain a catch of 400 to 500 billion pounds of fish—a very real potential for supplying critically needed sources of animal protein. Tragically, about 85 percent of this potential supply is now going to waste. This is true despite the fact that nearly every inhabited coastal area has some sort of fishing activity.

Systematic efforts to farm the seas have lagged far behind land efforts. Yet the seas, today a vast reservoir producing animal protein, can, with proper techniques, provide us with even more protein than we can now estimate.

There are many other logical and worthy uses that some of the funds from the outer Continental Shelf leases can be used for. But, these uses should be well planned ahead of time so that our generation and the generations to come can show that they have put funds from a depleting asset to the wisest and best

use. These resources should be used in a way to show that we have been good stewards of this resource. We should not have a hodge-podge, uncoordinated division of the total Outer Continental Shelf funds into any number of programs unrelated to the source of these revenues, particularly when the argument is made that the need for this proposal is that Congress has not realized the necessity for appropriating funds for that purpose sufficiently and has not appropriated a sum adequate to get on with what many believe to be a very desirable program.

We have also been tragically neglectful, in my opinion, in our efforts to discover and develop other resources of the sea. We just do not know what resources exist off our shores, and we have failed to apply either the dedication or the money necessary to get the job done.

We have lagged behind shamefully in the field of pollution abatement and in devising ways and means of controlling, or, even better yet, preventing the pollution of our oceans, rivers, and streams.

Our failure to devise an adequate system of hurricane protection, to protect the areas which produce the very revenues we are considering here today, has brought repeated disaster which I have discussed to some degree already.

Now, Mr. President, I wish to quote from the forward of a recent Department of the Interior bulletin, published in May 1966, in which the chairman of the Energy Policy Staff observed:

The preponderant part of offshore exploratory activity over the past 20 years has been concentrated in the area off the Louisiana Coast in water depths rarely exceeding 200 feet and to distances no more than 75 miles from shore. The remainder of the Continental Shelf adjacent to the contiguous United States and comprising well over 200,000 square miles has hardly been touched, although virtually all of it is considered to be favorable for the occurrence of petroleum deposits.

And, in fact, for other minerals.

A study prepared by the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution reported the existence of tremendous phosphorite and manganese deposits off the coast of Florida, North Carolina, and South Carolina, with significant deposits of petroleum indicated to be present off the coasts of all the Atlantic States, as far north as Massachusetts and Maine.

Thus the evidence is clear that after some 20 years of experience with submerged lands mineral production, we have not begun to even discover the magnitude of the resources which lie beneath the entire coast of this great Nation.

I am suggesting a program based upon the highest and best principles of enlightened conservation, utilizing a major portion of the proceeds derived from offshore development for the further development of those areas—for their protection, enhancement, and safekeeping. I urge this program, not only on the basis of precedent, but with the overriding conviction that the national interest can afford no other.

I refer to a permanent Federal program for the acquisition of knowledge and the

conservation and development of our vast and varied marine resources; water pollution control and abatement on the Continental Shelves and adjacent areas and in the Great Lakes; aquaculture; prevention of beach erosion; hurricane protection; aid to sea-grant colleges; fisheries development; the creation and maintenance of waterfront recreation facilities; oceanographic research; and increased support for desalinization research.

This would be an intensive, permanent, long-range program for research and maximum development of the vast and unbelievable potential of the sea. The food and mineral resources of the oceans are the greatest hope for coping with the overpopulation that is now coming upon us. Let it not ever be said that we lacked the foresight, the vision or the will to provide for the well being or even the survival of future generations.

We have made some token efforts in exploring the riches of the sea, skimming the surface of vast and varied potential resources which can only be discovered and produced if the kind of program I have in mind is adopted.

The program a number of us are anxious to promote will get this country on the way to stopping the dissipation of our national resources and instead put them to the greatest possible use of the people. We have made great strides in reclaiming the natural resources of the inland States. If we follow the same successful formula of turning revenues from the extraction of minerals back into efforts to further develop those areas, we could very quickly turn our coastal assets into a major new source of permanent national wealth.

It should be noted that one of the objectives of a Federal program should be the creation and maintenance of waterfront recreational facilities. The creation and maintenance of recreational facilities are the primary objectives of S. 1401 and of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, which S. 1401 proposes to amend. The supporters of S. 1401 should also support this item of the Federal program I favor, which would benefit such facilities on waterfronts.

In furtherance of the national interest in conservation, the depleting mineral resources of the Outer Continental Shelf areas must be used, in major part, to discover and develop all the resources of the sea, just as the Mineral Leasing Act provides that 52½ percent of the revenues from the depleting minerals of the Federal lands shall be dedicated to the reclamation of the arid land of the West.

Mr. President, I have here an illustration of the meagerness of the funds that have been invested in finding what we have in the sea and moving toward development of those resources. The size of that investment might be looked upon in comparison with the \$100 million of revenue per year produced from the sea for 3 years, and the \$200 million per year produced for the following 2 years, a total of \$700 million, which the sponsor of this bill would ask us to provide for additional park lands.

It is interesting to measure these figures against the funds available, and requested, to fund programs related to

improvement of the coastal zone; that is, the ocean and estuary areas adjacent to the coasts of our coastal States.

The March 1968 report of the President to the Congress on marine resources and engineering development states:

... Federal funding for these purposes amounted to \$21.4 million in FY 1967 and will reach \$28.7 million in FY 1968. Appropriation requests for FY 1969 are \$28.6 million.

Conservation and Recreation is the major cost category and is the one in which the major part of the FY 1968 expense occurred: \$20.2 million in FY 1968, as compared with \$15.4 million in FY 1967.

Another important increase in Federal responsibility, largely stemming from new legislation of 1965-66, has been in water quality management. Some of the most difficult water pollution problems are those in the Coastal Zone—the Great Lakes, estuaries, and other near-shore waters. For water quality management in the marine environment, expenditures in FY 1967 were \$4.5 million; funding for FY 1968 is estimated at \$7.0 million, and the appropriations requested for FY 1969 to \$8.7 million.

Imagine this, Mr. President: This bill would dedicate \$100 million in fiscal year 1969 for the purchase of park lands, the \$100 million to be drawn from resources yielded by our oceans, yet, during that same period, less than 10 percent of that amount would be available to halt pollution of our coastal waters. Indeed, the total Federal budget for programs operating in the entire coastal zone of our entire Nation aggregates only about one-third of the amount which the pending bill would dedicate to parks in 1 year alone.

Mr. President, when one pursues the logic of the committee report, the logic that Congress has been too niggardly in appropriating money for this purpose and that, therefore, all of the resources of the Outer Continental Shelf should be dedicated to this purpose and appropriated to none other—that is, to the extent of \$100 million a year for the first 3 years and \$200 million a year for the 2 years next following—it sets a precedent for everyone who has a good program. And I am sure that they would all be good programs or, at least, worthy of consideration. They would all come in and say, "Look, we have fine programs. We want you to earmark the remaining Outer Continental Shelf revenues, or some part of them, for our programs."

The able Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], when he was a delegate to the United Nations, suggested that the resources of the sea ought to be dedicated to the United Nations so that the United Nations could get on with its programs. There was some complaint at that time that the United Nations did not have enough funds, although the United States had always been the principal supporter of the United Nations. It was suggested, however, that the United Nations should be the recipient of what we could derive from the development of the resources of the sea.

When we considered the Submerged Lands Act several years ago, quite a few people wanted to dedicate the revenues from federally controlled lands beneath the sea to education—certainly a very

worthy purpose. However, well intended as it might be, as a practical matter the revenue that is derived from such resources, if it is to be dedicated at all—and I am not asking that it be dedicated at this point—should be dedicated to the support of certain reasonable, conservation practices that would provide, as a starting point, that as these resources are depleted they should be replaced with resources of permanent value, would something that could at least be replenished over and over again; we should replace these depleted resources with things of at least equal value, so that people in the coastal areas could survive, rather than simply depleting the resources and leaving nothing to take their place.

We have had experience through the years in which people have exploited some resources in order to get what they could out of them without putting anything back to replace them. Those experiences have all been glaring examples of poor conservation.

Some of the mining procedures used in the early years despoiled the whole countryside and left nothing there of value for the future.

We voted appropriations to create an Appalachia program. And I was proud to vote for the appropriation of money to help build the resources of an area which had been exploited without adequate reinvestment being made to develop something to take the place of the resources that had been removed.

I can well remember how in my boyhood one could look across the countryside at what had once been the gorgeous, virgin timberlands of Louisiana. There was not so much as a small tree to be seen. There was nothing but stumps and barren land that had been despoiled and destroyed by the harvesting of timber with no conservation practices pursued whatever.

They dragged the logs across the countryside on skids that ripped loose and destroyed what small plants and trees remained in the ground so that the whole countryside was barren for 60 years thereafter. Having raped these resources, the companies that had raped them, simply moved on.

I can recall a story an old-timer from north Louisiana told me about one of those lumber companies. The company was moving out. They had cut all of the trees. The people there had always voted against my father because the lumber companies had been opposed to him. Those companies had a great deal of influence with their labor because it was before the days when that kind of labor was organized at all.

The companies were in the process of moving out. The people were not moving out. They were being left there.

An oldtimer told me what my father told the people. He had said: "There goes that company. They have exploited all your resources, destroyed your timber, and damaged your land to the point that it will not produce anything for another 50 years. Nothing is left here worth having except maybe you. Now that these resources have been destroyed, they have no use for you either. So they are going

and telling you, like that oldtime country boy, 'Goodby, my honey. I am going. I will see you no more.'

That is about the kind of practice proposed when one suggests that we use and deplete these resources and dedicate their revenues to a totally unrelated purpose and put them where they cannot be used even to offset the damage that has been caused.

Mr. President, the inadequate consideration given to the matter by those who recommended the pending legislation and those who approved it in committee can well be illustrated by the pitiful treatment of the pollution problem.

Let me read what the committee report states in its cursory touching upon the pollution problem. The committee said that there was some suggestion that something ought to be done about pollution.

I will read this to show how the committee, composed primarily of Senators from interior States, could touch upon a problem and dismiss it with such light consideration when the problem is so tremendous and so important. Their action is due in large measure, I suppose, to the fact that those Senators and the people advising them never have studied in great depth the problem to which I refer.

On page 10 of the committee report, under the heading "Outer Shelf Protection," it states:

In considering making available a part of the revenues from mineral leasing operations on the Outer Continental Shelf, as provided in section 1(a), the committee also gave study to the danger of pollution from such operations.

Generally speaking, an oil company would be liable for any pollution damage resulting from negligence in its exploration, drilling, production, or transportation activities.

I pause there to show how completely the committee and its advisers missed the target.

When we have an oyster bed in the coastal waters, be they coastal waters where they are producing oil or coastal waters where oil will be produced in the future—in the Chesapeake Bay, one of its estuaries opening into that bay, or in the open sea—and find that the oysters are dead and are no longer there, one cannot say exactly why they are no longer there.

In Louisiana, where we are well aware of the problem, we cannot pinpoint exactly who is responsible for the fact that the oysters are dead or no longer existing there.

If one can establish—which cannot very well be done—why the oysters die, he cannot say who is responsible for it.

Texaco Inc. has a lease to the right. Shell Oil Co. has a lease to the left. Humble Oil Co. has a lease to the south. Chevron Oil Co. has a lease to the north. Kerr McGee has a lease to the southwest. We do not know who spilled the oil. We cannot prove that any one of those companies did it. However, the oysters are no longer there.

One has to find some other area in which to plant the oysters and start all over again. That resource has been damaged and destroyed completely. There is no one to sue. The only way to make good

on that resource is for the government to collect the money—just as the States and the Federal Government are doing—from the oil companies and have the government spend that money to overcome the damage that has been done to the area.

Mr. President, I read further from page 10 of the committee report:

However, a different problem would arise should pollution be caused by an act of God or should a ship crash into an offshore drilling or production structure, causing oil to flow into the sea. In the latter instance, as a matter of law, the negligent party would be liable for the resulting damage.

Mr. President, let me just discuss a problem that perhaps never occurred to the committee. It occurred to me at one time. Let me discuss this problem with respect to an experience I once had.

In some of the European countries which have had more experience with some of these pollution problems than we have had in some parts of the United States, laws have been passed, and have been in effect for years, to the effect that one cannot pump oil that might be polluted or contaminated into the harbors or into the bay in order to get rid of it.

At a time when I was in charge of a small naval craft, the ravages of the sea caused some damage to the bottom of the vessel, and salt water got into the diesel fuel. A large amount of diesel fuel was aboard the craft. The British were in control of the port of Philippeville at that time.

I asked an Englishman there: "How do I get rid of this contaminated diesel fuel?"

The fellow said: "Gee, I would not know. About the only thing I could see to do, if I had your problem, is to just sneak out to sea some night and pump that stuff overboard and pretend it never happened."

That is one way one might do it, and it would not be the first time someone disposed of diesel, or some other petroleum product that had become contaminated, in that manner. But in a situation like that, the damage of the pollution is done and no one knows who did it.

The committee report continues:

But, if the ship were a relatively small, individually owned vessel, for example, there well might not be sufficient assets to pay the costs of shoreline rehabilitation.

Mr. President, airline pilots tell me that they fly over oil slicks on the ocean which appear to be as much as 100 miles long. No one knows how those oil slicks occurred, but they had to occur from one of several reasons: A ship was torpedoed; a ship came to pieces in a storm; or, in the production of oil, a well got out of control and large amounts of oil came to the surface and drifted, pushed by the wind in one direction or the other, to where the pollution occurred.

Furthermore, the report does not discuss one of the other aspects of the pollution of the sea with which I am sure the distinguished junior Senator from Texas—who I am pleased to see in the Chamber—is familiar. So far as oil pollution is concerned, in many instances much of it results from the production

of oil in the upland areas. In the arid areas of Oklahoma or Texas or Louisiana, a fellow drills and tries to get some oil. He does the best he can, but he does not have much luck at it. He has a sludge pit in which he tries to separate the water from the oil. A big rain comes along and causes the sludge pit to overflow, and the contents of the pit go into the stream and find their way into the river, and eventually into the sea, where the ocean becomes polluted. Eventually, the stream is cleared out, but the ocean is polluted.

It is true that we have regulations by which we try to discourage people from flowing more oil than is necessary through those wells. But we cannot really be completely unkind toward the problems of a small, independent producer when he brings in a well that is producing very little oil, mostly salt water, and lets it run for a few days, in the hope that it might flush out the salt water and come in with a substantial amount of oil production—particularly if the game warden, who sees fish are being killed, is a relative or a friend. The game warden might realize that the man has lost quite a bit of money on the well and be tolerant with him and not be quick to force him to shut the well down when he is trying to bring it in.

Also, there is the spillage of oil and the spillage of gas on the highways and on the land around the areas where it is being refined and captured. That spillage, to a considerable extent, eventually is washed away by waters. It finds its way into the streams and on into the ocean, which is the final receptacle of all the pollutant. That is just one way in which the sea becomes polluted.

Another way in which the sea becomes polluted is by the failure to properly treat sewage which is produced in all parts of the country. In many instances it is pumped into the streams and washed down the rivers, into the oceans, creating a serious problem.

Some time ago we had a big fish kill in the Mississippi River. For a long time people thought those fish were killed by endrin, a commercial pesticide used in agriculture, which had been washed by the rain into the streams, down the rivers, and into the Gulf of Mexico. In Louisiana, we were told that certain oysters had to be taken off the market, and certain areas were examined very carefully, for fear that great additional areas would have to be taken out of seafood production because endrin had been found in the Mississippi River.

Presumably, that poison had got there because it had been used on growing crops, had been washed from the crops into the streams, and eventually found its way into the rivers and into the gulf. Subsequently, someone concluded that it is more likely that the endrin got there because a plant producing that chemical was located around Memphis and that one day, in getting rid of a lot of waste material, they just pumped the endrin into the Mississippi. That caused the pollution.

The point is that, in most instances, one cannot establish from where the pollution came, no more than one can pre-

cisely establish, simply by looking at the Potomac River or Lake Erie, the source of all that pollution.

But all sorts of dead fish and dead animal matter are around which indicate, if anyone has a doubt about it, that the water is polluted.

So there is a big problem, which one might say is glossed over in the committee report.

Mr. President, the report continues:

A proposal by Senator Kuchel that study be given to having an additional share of the offshore revenues available to pay for the cleaning of an area damaged by pollution in a situation where individual liability is inadequate or cannot be determined, was tentatively accepted for further consideration.

Accordingly, the committee requests that the Secretary of the Interior make investigation and report on such a proposal.

The committee wishes to make clear its intent that the proposal does not contemplate that the Federal Government would be an insurer against pollution or other damage resulting from offshore oil and gas operations. Rather, existing law and practices with respect to liability would continue in full force and effect. Fund monies would be available only in emergency situations or when no other sources were available.

After receiving the Secretary's reports and comments on the proposal, the committee will give the matter full and careful consideration.

Mr. President, the point I wish to make is that there is vast pollution now in the rivers flowing into the coastal areas, which flow into the Great Lakes, and which flow into the very areas which produce the revenues which this bill would earmark for parks and playgrounds. No matter how much one studies the matter, he is still going to find that it is an enormous task, and one which requires tremendous resources to clear up.

If one wishes to dedicate the resources produced by this oil to meet the pollution problem, be it the Connecticut River, the Mississippi River, or the Potomac River, it is better that these funds be dedicated to controlling the polluted water that is flowing in these rivers and polluting all of the sea for all time to come, than that there should be a dedication of the funds to use them to acquire more recreational purposes.

It seems to me that this program for providing more land for parks and recreation, desirable though it may be, should take its place in line with the great number of other Federal programs that would provide, in one respect or another, for advancing the national interest, each in its own way.

The resources we can make available for this purpose should be authorized and appropriated. The amendment proposed by my distinguished colleague from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] proposes that a substantial amount—in fact, the same amount of authorization that the Interior Committee would request—be made available. It would prevent an unwise and improper dedication of the source of these revenues to totally irrelevant purposes. In doing so, it would maintain the sound principles that Congress has pursued up to this point: that these revenues would go into the general

funds of the Treasury, and be available for whatever purposes Congress should authorize and appropriate money. At such time as Congress sees fit to provide for recreation or any other desirable purpose, it would provide whatever amount should be needed.

I look forward to the day when some of us can fully make our case, with adequate support and research to back up the point, that there are certain other needs directly related to the Outer Continental Shelf, particularly the development and exploration, to develop the vast resources it contains, which would justify a dedication. I do not ask for that now. I simply ask that these funds remain, as is the case with other Federal revenue, to be allocated by appropriation to purposes determined by the Congress to be in the best national interest.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PELL in the chair). The clerk will call the roll. The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the distinguished junior Senator from Washington and the other members of the Interior Committee are to be complimented for the fine work that they have done in regard to S. 1401, which amends the land and water conservation measures that we in the Senate have previously passed. I have, of course, long supported conservation measures. As such, I am in agreement with the aims of the measure currently before us. Ever since the days of Theodore Roosevelt, America has been dedicated to the idea of setting aside a portion of its land to make certain that when land was depleted for mining, foresting, or other such purposes, at least a portion of it should be restored or maintained in its natural state. We have made good progress in the conservation and restoration fields, and I am sure that we shall make better progress in the future.

Nevertheless, a number of things trouble me greatly about S. 1401. It is not the aims of the measure, but rather the way that the funds are procured for it. It has been the historical custom of the Senate to authorize measures and then send the request for the funds with which to carry them out to the Appropriations Committee for judicious consideration.

Mr. President, I want to commend the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] for his very eloquent discussion of this matter and calling the attention of the Senate and the public generally to some

aspects of the pending bill which should be carefully considered.

I should also like to commend the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] for offering his amendment which, I think, is a constructive and sound approach to this matter and which, I hope, will be adopted by the Senate.

Here are considered such things as national priorities, the overall availability of funds, the effect of particular expenditures on the economy, and the apportionment of available financial resources. It is a tried and true formula that has served us well in the past and continues to do so. We must not allow the Appropriations Committee to be bypassed in this instance, even for this most worthy cause, in order that the responsibility of the Congress to oversee the expenditure of funds shall not be usurped.

Of course, there is the objection that we have raised relative to the method of authorization and appropriation to which the Ellender amendment addresses itself, and which I believe would remedy.

Under the provisions of S. 1401, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to speculate in public property, practically free of all congressional control. He may, for example, buy a piece of land and hold it for a period of time, then resell it for a profit, retaining the profit in the trust fund for land purchases. The possibility thus exists that the fund could grow to be a multi-billion-dollar complex, far beyond anything that Congress has envisioned, leaving this money unavailable for appropriation by us to help solve the greatly expanding problems of America.

Another matter of concern in reviewing S. 1401 is the fact that the funds which are earmarked for this program come from the revenue being derived and to be derived from the Outer Continental Shelf. This money currently goes into the miscellaneous account of the Federal Treasury.

The proponents of using such funds would have us believe that they have discovered a treasure chest at the bottom of the sea to pay for this program. That, Mr. President, simply is not the case. As I mentioned a moment ago, these lands are currently being leased by the Government and the funds are going into the Federal Treasury. This money is currently vitally needed in the light of the present financial straits in which we find ourselves.

Mr. President, this does not seem to be the time to determine just what use will be made of the revenue that will be obtained from leasing the Outer Continental Shelf lands. There are currently many areas of dispute, and these should all be solved, or at least better understood, before such determination is even considered. It is my understanding that we do not know just what wealth may lie on the Outer Continental Shelf. I am advised that the Interior Committee has ordered a study of the matter superficially to determine just what the actual revenue might eventually be from this source. I believe that it would be much better to at least await the completion of this report before we divide up the dividends.

There are still other reasons to delay the disposition of the Outer Continental Shelf question. One of the best ones is the fact that the Outer Continental Shelf is a marine resource, and there has been as yet no comprehensive plan of marine conservation developed. It has been the historic practice to use resources developed from the land to finance land conservation projects. In fact, this has been the whole backbone of the conservation program and the reason for having it: we have determined to return to the land those resources which have been depleted from it. It has also been the historic precedent to use resources taken from the sea to replete the same. Thus, much of the money that has been taken in under the tidelands leasing arrangements has gone back into the sea in fishery projects, hurricane abatement, flood control, and navigational instruments. We should move cautiously if we are going to change this long-standing procedure.

Further, Mr. President, before a disposition of the funds derived from leasing the Outer Continental Shelf is finally arrived at in this body, we should await the easing of the budgetary situation and the development of comprehensive programs for the use of such lands. I can envision now that if we start using this revenue specifically for this purpose, next week someone may want to use another portion of it for something else, the next week there will be still more proposals to use more of the funds, and so on, until all of the funds, and possibly more, are dedicated to projects that have no relation whatsoever to the sea.

I need not remind the Members of this body of the great problems that have been arising in regard to the pollution of our oceans and the very serious need for developing a program in this area. Also, our fishing industry is in desperate need of help as their supplies in American waters are being depleted, and they must go thousands of miles from our coast to find a profitable catch. The Outer Continental Shelf simply must not be used as a submerged pork-barrel to finance the projects that we cannot finance through appropriate channels.

As I have stated previously, I support the objectives of S. 1401, and thus urge the Members of the Senate to enthusiastically endorse the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Louisiana, our colleague, Senator ELLENDER. This would authorize all the funds requested for the purchase of the desired locations, while at the same time requiring that this program, just like any other, go through the normal processes that all other measures must go through. I, for one, hope that all the funds for the measure will be authorized and appropriated. The measure, with the reservations that I have stated, is a just one and deserves our approval. However, in light of the fact that we have just seen fit in this body to pass the 10-percent surtax and to extend the excise taxes, I feel compelled to suggest that we cannot now begin to earmark funds that bypass our Appropriations Committee. If anything, now is the time for national belt-tightening and to let the world

know that we intend to live within our budget.

I feel certain that this is the best way to maintain our strong conservation program and to make certain in the future that we shall be able to have just as strong a maritime conservation program. I shall vote for the Ellender amendment and, I am very hopeful that my colleagues will, and I urge them to, do likewise.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the objectives of the pending measure are most certainly meritorious and the able chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs [Mr. JACKSON] is to be commended.

The primary purpose of this legislation is to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965—Public Law 88-578—by providing more funds for needed outdoor recreation programs at all levels of government throughout the Nation.

I voted for passage of the original land and water conservation bill when it was before the Senate on August 12, 1964, and I support the objectives that this measure would accomplish.

Within my own State, moneys available through the grant-in-aid program have made possible significant progress in assuring that West Virginians—today and in the future—will have an opportunity to enjoy the out of doors.

During consideration of this legislation, Carl L. Bradford, senior recreation planner for the State of West Virginia, appeared before the committee in support of this proposal. He represented the Honorable Hulett C. Smith, Governor of West Virginia, and Commerce Commissioner Angus E. Peyton. Mr. Bradford stated:

The immediate implementation of this program of development of the State's outdoor recreation resources is necessary due to urbanization, disappearing quality recreation lands, and escalation of both acquisition and development costs. Implementation of this program is estimated to require an investment of some \$42 million by the State (West Virginia) and its local governmental subdivisions during the next 5 years. Much of the success of this program hinges upon the availability of financial assistance from the land and water conservation fund . . .

In conclusion, West Virginia strongly urges favorable action on Senate bill 1401 and that utmost consideration be given to raising the fund ceiling above the \$200 million level recommended by the administration.

Moneys from the land and water fund are being used to establish the Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area and would also be available to help establish the Potomac National River which the administration proposed this last month.

The committee report—No. 1071—

clearly points out the necessity for action as follows:

Indisputedly, the land and water conservation fund has on the whole been a success during its first 3 years of operation. However, the money has not been sufficient to fulfill the objectives of the law, and unless new revenues are provided, the State and Federal outdoor recreation programs are in jeopardy.

The committee report then continues:

The deficiency of the fund is directly attributable to two causes: First, and most important, the skyrocketing rise in land prices as soon as it becomes known that the Federal Government is considering acquisition of an area, and second, the failure of the three sources established in the law to produce as much revenue as had been estimated at the time of enactment.

The matter of escalating land prices—which is of great concern to the members of the Public Works Committee in our consideration of Federal land costs for reservoir sites and highways—is covered by providing advance land acquisition authority to the Secretary of the Interior. Committee members will follow this closely as it may be one way to combat land cost escalations occasionally observed at water resource development programs handled by the Corps of Engineers.

One major impact of the proposed bill is to supplement the land and water conservation fund by earmarking about \$102 million annually for fiscal years 1969, 1970, and 1971 from the Outer Continental Shelf revenues from the sale of oil and gas and \$215 million annually for fiscal years 1972 and 1973. Although I have supported, and still do support the primary objectives of the pending bill by providing more money for public outdoor recreation opportunities, I cannot support the additional earmarking of miscellaneous receipts.

I remind the Senate that during our deliberation on the excise tax bill the Senate expressed the desire that all programs should be considered on their merit at the time the annual appropriations bills are thoroughly considered. To earmark the offshore oil receipts for any purpose gives special consideration to that purpose. The argument for the need for additional funds to accelerate worthy programs can just as soundly be applied to the flood control, navigation, municipal water supply, and other public works programs of the corps, to the program in Appalachia, water quality and air pollution control measures and Federal aid to schools, to name just a few.

We are concerned about funding Federal programs. However, we cannot create special earmarked funds from the General Treasury to carry out these worthy objectives. The only way that we can make a rational decision on these vital matters is to consider each program on its merit, which is in turn balanced against total budgetary constraints.

For these reasons I support the amendment No. 704, introduced by the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, unfortunately the very able and articulate senior Senator from California is necessarily absent during the pending debate on this

important measure now before the Senate, S. 1401, of which the Senator is a cosponsor. Because I know Senators would benefit from reading the remarks of the ranking member of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee on the pending bill, I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KUCHEL

The last decade has been a decade of awakening for the United States—awakening to the importance of conservation of our limited and priceless natural resources.

In recent years, Congress has authorized the addition of more than fifty new areas to the national park system.

Public use of recreation areas has also greatly increased. Last year, it is estimated that 1.5 billion visits were made to public recreation areas—federal, state and local, nearly double the 1960 estimate of 820 million visits.

We need more recreation areas. As Americans gain more leisure time, and as population grows, we especially need areas readily available to the growing urban population centers.

Three years ago, for the first time, America was given a continuing source of money to help provide expanded outdoor recreation opportunities. That source is the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

Through the first three years, \$214,314,000 has been made available for state and local needs on a dollar-for-dollar matching basis from the Land Water Conservation Fund. Another \$131,152,000 has been allocated from the Fund to acquire needed recreation lands and waters in national parks, national forests, national wildlife refuges, and other federal recreation areas.

In spite of the tremendous accomplishments of the Fund in stimulating efforts to meet the recreation needs of the American people, it has still fallen far behind the surging demand. Parks cost money—money to acquire property, money for development, money to maintain and expand existing facilities.

My own State of California has a crucial stake in the matter. By the turn of the century our population is expected to be 50 million, more than double what it is today. Action must be taken now to assure that adequate parks, recreation areas, seashores and wilderness areas are provided to keep pace with the huge human influx.

There is a large and growing gap between the cost of protecting our natural heritage for future generations, and the money available in the Land and Water Conservation Fund. As the result of a six-month study, the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation concluded: "It seems fairly clear that the Land and Water Conservation Fund will fail to meet minimum program needs over the next 10 years by possibly \$2.7 billion, considering both Federal and State needs."

Unless this conservation gap is closed, much of the magnificent park legislation which has passed through this Committee, and the Congress, in the past few years may stand on the statute books as unfulfilled dreams.

To meet that conservation gap, the Chairman of the Interior Committee (Mr. Jackson) has proposed a bill, S. 1401, which I am privileged to cosponsor. This bill should meet the need to have adequate funds to purchase park and recreation lands and waters before they are priced out of reach or committed irrevocably to other uses, and

to insure acquisition of property quickly after congressional authorization of park or recreation areas.

S. 1401 solves the first problem by providing for additional revenues to the Land and Water Conservation Fund from a portion of the Outer Continental Shelf leasing revenues which presently go into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

The State of California pioneered a similar approach over 20 years ago. For many years, and during the time when I was State Controller, California was financing its state park acquisitions with its tidelands' oil revenues. By spending the peoples' income from their land resources for the acquisition and development of recreation areas, the State of California built an unparalleled state park system.

Our Nation should follow the example set by California. These earnings, which represent the earnings of the American people from their depleting resources, should be returned to the people in the form of a new and lasting land resource, parks and recreation areas.

The problem of insufficient funds is complicated by the rising cost of land acquisition and development. The time gap between the designation of an area for consideration for national enjoyment, its approval by Congress, and the appropriation of funds to carry out the plan of procurement and development, is often great. Often a period of several years elapses before funds are available to perform the actual land purchases.

The problem of land price escalation for public park and recreation areas is grave. The Point Reyes National Seashore is a staggering example. The 1962 Act establishing that seashore carried a \$14 million price tag. Congress has boosted the ceiling slightly, to \$19,135,000, but it has already been put on notice that the final cost may run in excess of \$55 million.

The most important factor in controlling land price is time. If property can be acquired quickly, it can be acquired at less cost. S. 1401 authorizes the head of an agency to obligate the federal government by contract in advance of actual appropriations. This authority is limited to the next two fiscal years and to an amount not exceeding \$30 million per year.

An amendment has been offered by the Senior Senator from Louisiana (Mr. Ellender), who is Chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on which I have the honor to serve as ranking Republican. While I have great respect for his judgment, and the highest regard for his friendship, I must oppose the amendment.

The Ellender amendment would gut S. 1401. It would be worse for conservation than the status quo. It would, I fear, spell doom for the Redwood National Park, and for many other national, state and local parks which depend for their fulfillment on the enactment of legislation to provide an adequate Land and Water Conservation Fund.

The telegram which was sent to me by the Citizens Committee on Natural Resources on February 20, 1968, and which opposes the Ellender amendment, is as follows:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,

February 20, 1968.

Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

An amendment to S. 1401 would remove the new sources of revenue for the land and water conservation fund provided in S. 1401. The amendment would substitute for the loss of these new revenue sources authorizations to be appropriated at a level of \$200 million from the general fund. We oppose this amendment. The fund was established originally because of the failure in obtaining necessary appropriations from the general fund and the advanced appropriations authorized by the land and water conservation

fund from the general fund have not been appropriated. A so-called compromise amendment would allocate 37½ percent of the Outer Continental Shelf leasing revenues to the States which are contiguous to the water areas where leases are established. The remaining 62½ percent of the Outer Continental Shelf lease revenues would be credited to the land and water conservation fund. We oppose this compromise amendment since it would unnecessarily ally land and water conservation fund revenues with a special privilege to a few States and if accepted make passage of S. 1401 highly questionable.

SPENCER M. SMITH, JR.,

Secretary, Citizens Committee on Natural Resources.

The bill now pending before the Senate is the most important conservation measure which will come before the Senate this year. Without an adequate Fund, legislation authorizing new parks will be meaningless.

This bill represents the future of conservation in America. It presents the Congress with an opportunity to decide whether we, as a nation are committed to conservation only in word, or whether we truly believe that we must act to protect the God-given world of nature from despoliation. In this legislation we have an opportunity to demonstrate our determination to give future generations of Americans a better environment in which to live. I urge each and every one of my colleagues to vote for S. 1401.

The California Director of Parks and Recreation, Mr. William Penn Mott, representing Governor Ronald Reagan, testified before our Committee that California alone needs six times the amount of money that has been available to it from the fund. The testimony of Mr. Mott, in support of S. 1401, is as follows:

"STATEMENT OF WILLIAM PENN MOTT, JR., DIRECTOR OF PARKS AND RECREATION, STATE OF CALIFORNIA

"Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that there is before your committee two bills pertaining to the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act program, Senate bill 1401, introduced by Senator Henry M. Jackson, and Senate bill S. 531, introduced by Senator Thomas H. Kuchel.

"I wish to speak in support of the concept which these two bills present, namely providing additional funds for the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act program, July 1, 1967, marked the third year in which applications have been accepted in California for consideration under the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act program. During this period in which \$11 million was available as California's share of this fund, we received applications far in excess of \$70 million worth of projects. In other words, the demand for funds exceeded the money available by more than 600 percent.

"This demand for funds for land acquisition and capital improvement to meet the recreation demands in California is directly related to the rapid growth being experienced by the State. The California State Department of Finance estimated that the population of California as of January 1, 1968, was 19,774,000, an increase of more than 2 percent over the January 1, 1967, figure of 19,380,000. California's population has increased more than 4 percent during the period of its participation in the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act program; however, during this same period our annual apportionment has actually decreased. Based upon an average increase in population of 2 percent a year, it is estimated that California's population will increase more than 20 percent in the next 10 years.

"We find that even at the present time, our population is continuing to increase at the rate of approximately 1,000 people per month. With this growth rate, which is one of the fastest in the Nation, we are confident that

the demand for land and water conservation funds will continue to outstrip the supply of these funds. Statistics gathered in California indicate that the local cities, counties, and special districts are capable of matching funds from the land and water conservation fund to at least four times the amount now being received by California from the fund, which is approximately \$3½ million.

"California is proud of its record in the distribution of these funds. Of the \$11 million received, we have distributed this money to 57 separate projects; \$6,400,000, or 59 percent, has been obligated to 35 acquisition projects, 4 of them State and 21 local; \$4,500,000, or 40 percent, has been for 31 development projects, 7 State projects and 24 local; and \$100,000, or 1 percent, has been obligated for one planning project. It should be noted that the percentage distribution of acquisition projects over development projects is consistent with that suggested by the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation.

"Of the 57 funded projects, 43 are local projects sponsored by 33 separate local jurisdictions: 15 counties, 15 cities and 3 recreation and park districts represent the local jurisdictions. These are distributed quite evenly throughout the entire State. Twelve State projects have been funded. Six of these projects are the responsibility of the Department of Parks and Recreation and six of them are the responsibility of the Fish and Wildlife Conservation Board.

"Of the \$11 million received in California, \$3,200,000 has been requested or paid out by the end of the current fiscal year, June 30, 1968, and before the end of this fiscal year, an additional \$2 million will be either requested from the Federal Government or disbursed to participants. California has received, in addition to the \$11 million, approval for \$3,500,000 from the Secretary's special contingency fund; \$2 million of this has been received and disbursed for the acquisition of the Pepperwood Grove project in the Humboldt Redwoods State Park. The additional \$1,500,000 will be received by the end of the current fiscal year. This will complete the contingency fund project.

"The Department held during the month of January 1968, four public hearings to discuss the rules and regulations for the disbursement of Federal funds to State agencies and local jurisdictions. Although land acquisition remains critical, particularly for the larger metropolitan areas, the rural areas of the State feel that there must be greater emphasis placed on development in order for them to continue with land acquisition. There appears to be considerable feeling in the rural and suburban areas that allowing open space to remain undeveloped may prohibit further acquisition or make it impossible to hold open space for park and recreation purposes.

"The department of parks and recreation for the State of California now owns, operates, and maintains in excess of 800,000 acres of land comprised of 200 units which make up the State park system. Although there are critical needs for land acquisition, such as the beaches, rounding out existing State parks, and eliminating inholdings within State parks, and the acquisition of State parks which will serve the major metropolitan areas, the greater emphasis should be placed on developing existing State parks.

"Mr. Chairman, the above information should provide your committee with ample evidence that additional funds are desperately needed during the next several years to meet, in California, the demand for funds from the land and water conservation fund and it is for this reason that I strongly recommend your approving either Senate bill 1401 or S. 531.

"Thank you."

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] is to be

complimented for his leadership in bringing to the floor of the Senate S. 1401. It is noteworthy also that the vote of the Senate Interior Committee in reporting this bill, as amended, was unanimous.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, which this bill would strengthen, has met an urgent need in the Nation as a whole and in Michigan. I was a cosponsor of the original bill, as I am of S. 1401, recognizing as I do that our generation has an obligation to preserve unspoiled areas for the refreshment of future generations.

The fund desperately needs additional sources of revenue. It is also imperative that the Secretary of the Interior be provided with advance contract authority and with authority to acquire options. All of us who have struggled to establish national parks or lakeshores in our States are aware of the destruction of scenic values and the land-cost escalation that take place during the years that are involved in securing congressional approval of the proposal.

Admittedly, Mr. President, I have a parochial interest in this legislation. The acquisition and development plan at the recently established Pictured Rocks National Lakeshore will be drawn from this fund, as will future expenditures for our long overdue Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore. But all Senators have land preservation proposals—large or small—which are in a now-or-never status and for which the answer will be never unless this bill passes.

Mr. President, I join in urging Senate approval of this important bill. The Michigan Department of Conservation, which has responsibility for our State's water pollution program as well as for our land resource program, has given this legislation high priority. It is in truth emergency legislation.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I would like to express my strong support of S. 1401. I can think of no more important conservation legislation in this session of the Congress than this bill to put new and adequate resources into the land and water conservation fund.

As floor manager for the land and water conservation fund bill when it passed the Senate in 1965, as a ranking member of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, and as one who attended the committee's hearings on this proposed amendment, I am convinced of its need.

This is an emergency measure vitally necessary to help resolve the ever-increasing land price escalation problem. It is also designed to carry out our original legislative intent to encourage the States to expand outdoor recreational opportunities for their people.

My own State of Idaho provides an example of how land and water conservation funds have been successfully used, and why additional funding is needed. My State has 39 projects totaling over \$2.9 million which have been implemented through the fund. Yet, through fiscal 1967, all of the funds allocated to the State under this act have been obligated and funds apportioned under fiscal 1968 will be obligated by June 30, 1968.

Our State has more money available than there is Federal money to match, particularly for park developments. I am informed by Ernest E. Day, chairman of the Idaho State Park Board, that the State's outdoor recreation needs cannot be met at the current level of funding.

I am sure this same situation must exist in other States, which have been encouraged to place a priority on their outdoor recreation programs.

At the same time, I think Idaho's program bears out the success of this legislation and represents, in my judgment, an outstanding example of effective partnership between Federal and State Governments in this field.

I am more than pleased to join in the fullest support of this important measure.

STATEMENT OF POSITION

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I have a scheduled engagement in Wisconsin starting tomorrow. I am unable to ascertain whether or not we are going to vote on the pending amendment to the bill on Thursday, Friday, or at all this week, or whether there will be an agreed-upon time to vote next week. I have discussed the matter with the majority whip. He has advised me that, in the event there should be a vote on Thursday or Friday—which he does not know, either—he will undertake to get a pair for me.

If I were present, I would vote against the pending amendment and for the bill, S. 1401.

REPEAL OF SECTION 315—FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS ACT

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, 9 years ago, in 1959, I introduced a bill to repeal section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934. Later I suggested that, at the very least, newscasts and public affairs programs be exempt from the provisions of this section.

From my proposed Fair Political Broadcasting Code of 1959, came an easing to the restrictions imposed upon broadcasters. This was, in fact, first official recognition by Congress that the communications media were at least mature enough to make their own public affairs and news judgments.

In 1960 provisions of the act were suspended so that the public could see two candidates for the Presidency debate the issues and answer questions from panels of newsmen. Without this suspension, networks and stations would not have given freely of their precious time for the great Kennedy-Nixon debates. Without this suspension, the same privilege would have to be given to an assortment of minor candidates unknown to the vast general public.

I proposed then that section 315 be suspended, too, for similar airing of debates and other appearances of substantial candidates for various offices. We discussed and we debated advisability of suspension of the act on purely local elections, on congressional, senatorial, and gubernatorial races.

Finally, the free and open exchange between the late John F. Kennedy and Richard M. Nixon took place. And the presidential debates became a part of the

fabric of American political life. Overnight the soapbox and the political rally gave way to millions of Americans who could sit in their living rooms and run up the highest record ratings while watching two major candidates for President. Those who could not watch, could hear on radio.

In 1961, the Federal Communications Commission reported that nearly all network affiliates in both radio and television carried the debates. It has been estimated that at least 120 million persons watched and heard them.

The suspension of section 315 in connection with the presidential race also made it possible in turning over to candidates and their committees considerable additional time for programs of their own preparation. In 1960 the three TV networks provided 37 hours and 47 minutes of free sustaining time in this fashion. Four years before, only 19 hours and 8 minutes was provided.

Radio networks also increased the sustaining time given to the two major candidates and their committees from 20 hours and 38 minutes in 1956 to 42 hours and 23 minutes in 1960.

When we lifted the restrictions on newscasts, panel shows, and public affairs discussions, there were those in this body who were genuinely concerned lest the industry misuse this new freedom. Every study has shown the broadcast media to be temperate, prudent, and generally fair. After all, fairness can hardly be legislated, while unfairness may be practiced even when it is illegal. The definitions of fairness and equality vary with the judge.

Following the temporary lifting of section 315 for the presidential debates of 1960, many of us hoped we would see repeal of this section. I have introduced several repealers myself.

In 1964, with an incumbent President as a candidate for reelection, it was natural to assume that there was no great desire on the part of many to lose this advantage by virtually legislating free and open debates in which the challenger would gain some benefit from appearing with the President. This was an insufficient excuse for me.

In any event, we have no such excuse this year. Let us, then, provide for the debates that lie ahead in this exciting and unpredictable political year. There are many respected voices in the broadcasting industry that have spoken out clearly for temporary lifting of section 315 as it pertains to the presidential campaign.

I have said before and I say again that a provision of law that must periodically be suspended is not worth leaving on the books. Besides, if presidential debates are good, so are others for other offices.

The distinguished Senator from Rhode Island, who is chairman of the very important Communications Subcommittee, has been ill. Now that he is back among us, I certainly hope he will be able to schedule an early executive session on the proposal to repeal section 315.

In 1960, suspension was approved only

90 days before election. Let us not delay so that the 1968 campaign coverage and debates will be rushed at the last minute. And while we are providing for the debates by presidential candidates, why not finish the job for all time for all offices and repeal section 315?

I am certain the Federal Communications Commission has plenty of tools left to insure that the stations and the networks will do what most of us know full well they will—provide fair and honest and complete coverage to the limit of their ability.

"COMMONSENSE AND THE RISKS IN SOUTHEAST ASIA"—ADDRESS BY SENATOR KUCHEL

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the distinguished minority deputy leader, the Honorable THOMAS KUCHEL, of California, today made a statement in Long Beach, Calif., to the Long Beach Rotary Club. I have here a partial text of the remarks of our distinguished colleague, under the title of "Commonsense and the Risks in Southeast Asia."

I must say that it is a quite pragmatic and realistic statement, and I think our colleague sets out fully what the situation is and what the course before us is. He describes it as long and hard, and with that I think everybody will agree.

Our colleague carries one quotation in the partial text that I had forgotten, but it came back to me when I saw it. It was a statement made by Adm. C. Turner Joy, whom I think we consider as a distinguished hero, who put up with continual harassment while negotiating peace in Korea.

At that time Admiral Joy warned:

To concede a minor point to the Communists without a like concession from them is but to convince them that in more substantive issues, you will ultimately submit to their viewpoint.

I think history shows and bears out the truth of that statement. Nobody knows it any better than our principal negotiator at that time, Admiral Joy, long years ago in Korea.

I commend the distinguished Republican whip on this statement, and ask unanimous consent that it be made a part of my remarks in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the partial text of the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMONSENSE AND THE RISKS IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

(Partial text of remarks by U.S. Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL before the Long Beach Rotary Club, Lafayette Hotel, Long Beach, Calif., April 24, 1968)

A new phase of the war in Vietnam has opened with recent, albeit halting, steps toward negotiation. We all would rejoice at the transfer of the conflict from the battlefield to the bargaining table. Such a welcome move would not suggest that our military effort has been unavailing. To the contrary, the Communist armies of the Viet Cong and of North Vietnam have failed to achieve the conquest of the South. They have been prevented by superior forces from achieving an evil goal, which in the anxious months of 1965 seemed within their grasp.

The aim of America and her allies in the conflict in Vietnam has long been a just settlement and an enduring peace based on the free choice of the peoples in each nation of the Far East. Surely this has not been an easy policy for America and her allies to pursue. Some argue that we could have ignored events, allowing the conquest of South Vietnam by Ho Chi Minh. Such a course would neither have been wise nor just. It would have been morally wrong, and it could have represented a very disheartening milestone in the progress of Asiatic Communism for the rest of the world to see.

It would have meant taking an enormous risk. The leaders of the non-Communist nations of Asia have repeatedly warned of the grim potential of a Communist onslaught beyond Vietnam. The jungles of Laos are seething with Communist troops. Even Cambodia has a Communist uprising. Thailand faces a serious subversive threat. Neutral Burma, after 20 years, knows no peace. The Hukhs are reappearing in the Philippine jungles. All across the southern flank of East Asia there is a zone of rising conflict.

A total peace must be sought if we are to end war in Asia in this decade. We must beware of oversimplification. We confront a highly complex situation not susceptible to solution by an easy cease fire. Indeed, an easy cease fire could be a shame to those who love peace. In the long run, the difference between military success and diplomatic settlement may be much less than that between settlement and surrender.

The President has chosen, by suddenly terminating his own career, to remove any doubt about America's willingness to seek an honorable peace through honorable negotiation. I support this effort as a means of gaining a true and durable peace. I would not support window dressing to disguise our unilateral withdrawal.

The tortured history of Asia has brought Americans to fight on Oriental shores three times in the past generation. Our goal must be that this cycle of bloodshed be brought to an end, once and for all. The greater risk for America today is to ignore the lessons of history or to be too proud and, perhaps, too dumb to try to profit from experience.

The road out of Vietnam is going to be long and difficult. Of course, our people want an end to the conflict. But peace cannot be achieved merely by excusing ourselves from the scene of carnage and suffering and stealing away. That course would only lead to further conflagration.

Our military leaders, it seems to me, have been correct in trying to keep the scale of fighting in Vietnam below the threshold of global conflict. Such a danger has always been present and real. By the same token, Vietnam is a part of a larger picture. A sacrifice of that relatively small and unimportant country to the insatiable appetite of Asiatic Communism would not gain another hour of independence for Laos, Cambodia or Thailand, or the countries beyond the land mass of Southeast Asia.

The path to settlement requires that these broader factors be taken fully into account. The wrangle over where to meet is simply the first, and surely not the most important, of the knots to be untied. Admiral C. Turner Joy, a distinguished American hero, who put up with continual harassment while negotiating peace in Korea, warned, "To concede a minor point to the Communists without a like concession from them is but to convince them that in more substantive issues, you will ultimately submit to their viewpoint."

I believe we shall get to the point of actual negotiation but the process will be long and arduous. There are a few simple precepts which ought to guide us.

In negotiation we need to move from strength. The doctrines of Mao prescribe a

tactic known as "fighting while negotiating". The continued, covert buildup of North Vietnamese troops in the Saigon area is evidence that their present gestures toward talks of peace are in keeping with this rule. Free World forces will need to respond in kind. The heroic and successful defense of Khe-sanh has shown our ability to accomplish such a purpose. Our government and our people must beware of tactical maneuvers and surprise by the Communists, for propaganda or political ends. For example, the North might conceivably and histrionically choose unilaterally to impose a cease fire on its own terms. Such a maneuver would catch us ill-prepared and in unsound defensive positions. God alone knows what some in our society who scream for peace at almost any price would do under such conditions.

Unwise counsel can be particularly dangerous in this situation. Some of my Senate colleagues, by criticizing the moves of our military commanders, may well be limiting America's options in terms of correct response to Communist duplicity. We have nothing to fear from continuing to maintain our forces at full strength as the bilateral talks hopefully may begin and proceed. Indeed, that would seem to be the only safe course open to us.

Neither political leaders, nor the public at large, as I view those momentous days, should seek continually to second guess our professional leadership, either military or diplomatic, who have to deal daily with the vexing puzzle of how to grope towards an honorable peace. The people of this country have shown that they place a decent peace above indecent politics. They want settlement, but not surrender. Each of us, the governing and the governed, has a duty to perform in maintaining unity behind this national must. Members of Congress, Senators, and the President himself, cannot be exempt from this responsibility.

We must assure that bilateral talks between America and Hanoi are quickly expanded to include all parties to the conflict. A lasting peace will require a broad meeting generally along the line of the 1954 Geneva meeting. I doubt very much that, in her extreme isolationism and widespread convulsions, Communist China would attend, but I do believe that we must pin down the Communist world to a full settlement in Asia. This is, after all, the goal of our policy. This Administration has a somewhat regrettable penchant for acting on its own without ever touching base with our allies, or, as we have just seen in Hawaii, at least until after the fact. Our role in Asia is part of a joint effort at collective security. America cannot go it alone—neither by withdrawing to some kind of an isolated nuclear defense, nor by trying to be the world's policeman in any of the far flung hemispheres of our planet.

One of the problems constantly plaguing our effort in Southeast Asia has been an over-concentration of control in the White House. At regular Tuesday White House luncheons, the President and one or two advisors have picked impending bombing targets. There has been similar concentrated pre-occupation with the details of day by day diplomacy. It is not in our national interest to promise to meet "anywhere anytime" if we later find we are not prepared to do so. It is not in our interest to promise, as we did at Manila, to leave Vietnam in six months, if we later find that such precipitate withdrawal would endanger the lives of millions of Vietnamese.

Common sense tells us that effective negotiations require the Communist side to understand that we stand by what we say, both in terms of our commitment to freedom, and to the cause of a just peace.

Realism demands that we keep our options open.

Experience has shown us time and again that we must not be wed to past mistakes.

History will record as a major event in modern times the abrupt termination of a career of the most powerful public servant on earth, to the cause of peace in a small country half way around the world. That act by the President was courageous. You and I commend it. But it demonstrates that we have indeed come to a crisis of leadership in our country.

Mere recognition of that apparently unselfish act does not extricate us from terrible and hazardous ground where we have fallen. The principles needed to bring us to better days are rooted in the essential American belief that our country must remain strong in order that she shall remain free.

Without in any sense making these comments partisan, I devoutly believe that my political party has a unique moment in the history of our Republic to rise to the challenge of America.

The option for settlement by negotiations offers the best chance of peace to a united people. If we can move forward with confidence and determination, the pace towards solution could accelerate. Each step away from the law of the jungle world makes it harder for either side to resort to warfare. The need for peace, we can be sure, is felt keenly by the Communist North. A momentum can build, if given a start, making a return to escalation more and more unlikely and unnecessary. That is the course of events for which we pray. It requires that we keep our wits, and that we make our moves unmistakably clear.

The great Nineteenth Century British statesman Benjamin Disraeli, in a masterful understatement, once said that "frank and explicit" is the best diplomatic attitude to keep "our own minds clear, while confusing the minds of others." We have got to see things as they are, and stake out our course with courage and conviction. A united America can do this now, as a united America has done before, and as we must do, if your and my freedom are to have a sound hope for survival.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hackney, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 3135) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 by extending the authorization of appropriations for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 14940) to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act, as amended, in order to extend the authorization for appropriations; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MORGAN, Mr. ZABLOCKI, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. HAYS, Mr. ADAIR, Mr. MAILLIARD, and Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 13738) to increase the maximum rate of per diem allowance for employees of the Government traveling on official business, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the

House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 655) recognizing the 25th anniversary of the Warsaw ghetto uprising, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 13738) to increase the maximum rate of per diem allowance for employees of the Government traveling on official business, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION PLACED ON CALENDAR

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 655) recognizing the 25th anniversary of the Warsaw ghetto uprising, was placed on the calendar.

Mr. DIRKSEN subsequently said: Mr. President, there is at the desk House Concurrent Resolution 655, to commemorate the 25th anniversary of the uprising in the Warsaw ghetto. It passed the House yesterday. I assume I ought to ask unanimous consent now that it be placed on the Senate Calendar, so it can be called up and acted upon tomorrow; and I do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the concurrent resolution will be placed on the calendar.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 25, 1968, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 24, 1968:

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as follows:

To be general

Lt. Gen. Andrew Jackson Goodpaster, O21739, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Gen. Harold Keith Johnson, O19187, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), to be placed on the retired list in the grade of general under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962.

Gen. William Childs Westmoreland, O20223, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), for appointment as Chief of Staff, U.S. Army, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3034.

IN THE NAVY

Adm. Ulysses S. G. Sharp, Jr., U.S. Navy, for appointment to the grade of admiral on the retired list pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 5233.